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## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The second edition has been revised throughout. I have been convinced by the arguments of several reviewers that my view of the difficult passage in 44 в requires modification, and I have modified it accordingly. In one or two other passages I have expressed myself (I hope) more clearly: otherwise there is no change.

I desire to thank the reviewers in England and in Germany for their courreous and considerate reception of this little work.

Emmanuel Collegf, Cambridge, February 21, 189 I .

## PREFACE.

No apology is needed for a new edition of the Crito. The only edition in English which possesses more than a purely ephemeral value is Dyer's reproduction of Cron (Boston, 1885). And to my mind the Crito is one of the finest of Plato's minor dialogues, breathing the most exalted morality, full of the deepest historical interest, and above all (as I think I have shewn in my Introduction) perfect as a work of art. As in the Apology, so here, I have followed on the whole the readings of the Bodieian. But I am as far as possible from wishing to disparage the second family of manuscripts, and it will be seen from my critical appendix that I have not infrequently preferred a reading traceable to it.

The editors to whom I am most indebted in the formation of the text are Schanz and Kral: for the interpretation I have found Cron's edition far the most valuable. I have also consulted the editions by Wohlrab and Göbel, and other critical contributions to the study of the dialogue referred to in my notes. But I have frequently
ventured to differ from the other editors in the interpretation of the dialogue : and a large part of the commentary is my own.

I have again gratefully to acknowledge my obligations to Mr Neil.

Emmanuel College, November 25, 1887.

## INTRODUCTION.

The Crito is one of the Socratic tetralogy of dialogues, embracing the Euthyphro, the Apology, the Crito and the Phaedo. The justification for grouping these together is that each of them is concerned with the circumstances of Socrates' trial, imprisonment and death. At the outset of the Euthyphro, we are favoured with a description of Socrates' accuser, together with a brief account of the indictment: while in the rest of the dialogue Plato proceeds to refute by anticipation the charge of impiety, shewing how infinitely more reverent is the scepticism of Socrates than the unreflecting orthodoxy of which Euthyphro is the exponent. The Apology was intended by Plato to be a triumphant vindication of the whole faith and practice of his master in society, religion and politics. In the Crito and the Phaedo we are brought face to face with issues which are at once narrower and wider: narrower, inasmuch as they deal with one particular aspect of Socrates' personality, the Crito with his political, the Phaedo with his eschatological views, freely developed and expanded by Plato: wider, because in both we are introduced to problems of more universal interest, in the Crito to the relation between the individual and the State, in the Phaedo to the inımortality of the soul.

If we regard the Euthyphro as a kind of prologue to the great trilogy of which Socrates is the central figure, we shall see in the Crito as it were the second drama, related to the first and last much as the Choephori is related to the Agamemnon and the Eumenides. From one point of view, indeed, there might seem to be a closer connection between the Crito and the Phaedo than between it and the Apology: for while in the first member of the trilogy we have Socrates' Apologia pro vita sua, the other two set before us his Apologia pro morte sua: in the Crito we have the citizen's justification for remaining to die, in the Phaedo the philosopher's, the hope of immortality. But on a closer examination we shall see that our dialogue is rather an epilogue to the Apology than a prologue to the Phaedo. There is little in the doctrine of the two first dialogues that travels beyond the standpoint of the historical Socrates, whereas in the purely philosophical sections of the Phaedo, Socrates speaks for Plato rather than for himself. And in the second place, we are introduced in the Crito to an elaborate refutation of the political prejudice against Socrates which lent such fatal force to the indictment ${ }^{1}$, a prejudice touched upon, it is true, in the Apology ${ }^{2}$, but for the first time thoroughly exposed and rebutted in our dialogue. So far from being the enemy of his country and the corrupter of his fellow-citizens, the Crito sets before us Socrates as the only true patriot, faithful to his country and her laws even at a moment when average Athenian morality as interpreted by the mouth of Crito pronounced it to be not only ex-

[^0]cusable but his imperative duty to break the laws and save his life ${ }^{1}$. The structure of the dialogue is admirably adapted for the purpose of exhibiting the patriotism of Socrates, and reveals throughout a close analogy to the actual circumstances of Socrates' trial, defence and condemnation. As the correct apprehension of this analogy will bring still more clearly into view the real scope and meaning of the Crito, I will endeavour to trace it in detail: the subject-matter of our dialogue will be considered later.

In the trial of Socrates, there were three parties concerned-the prosecution, represented by Meletus and his associates, Socrates himself as the defendant, and the judges. The charge was virtually one of High Treason: Socrates, it was alleged, had been unfaithful to his country by endeavouring to demoralise her youth and refusing to recognise her gods. A verdict of guilty was returned and Socrates condemned to death: this much the Apology gives us. In the Crito, as it appears to me, the semblance of a trial is still preserved, under the mask of dialogue. This time Socrates is judge, Crito prosecutor, the State prisoner at the bar. The charge is wrong-doing ( $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{c} v$ ): the verdict one of acquittal. I see frequent indications of such a juridical structure throughout the Crito, such as the personification of the Laws, the use of $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \lambda$ v́val $^{\text {vó́povs as a figurative expression for }}$ breaking the laws ( $50 \mathrm{~A}, 50 \mathrm{D}, 5 \mathrm{IA}, 54 \mathrm{C}$ ), perhaps also the use of $\epsilon i \sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ in 48 a (oủк $\dot{\rho} \rho \theta \hat{\omega} s \in i \sigma \eta \gamma \in \hat{\imath}$,

 $\tau(\omega v)$, and in particular the words of Socrates in 50 B,

[^1]just after the Laws have been brought upon the stage:

 $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ кvрías єival ${ }^{1}$. The framework upon which the Crito hangs is hidden throughout the two opening chapters by the dramatic setting of the dialogue, nor does it emerge into view for some time, owing to the peculiar form which Crito's speech against the State of necessity assumed: partly for artistic reasons, and partly no doubt in order to conform to historical truth, Plato felt bound to make Crito arraign the State indirectly rather than directly-by means of earnest entreaties addressed to Socrates urging him to effect an illegal escape. It is not till we reach the sixth Chapter, in which Socrates begins to expound and emphasize the principle upon which the verdict ought to hinge, that the essentially legal structure of the dialogue first comes clearly before our eyes. Socrates the judge lays down the higher and unwritten law by which the State is to be judged: oṽтє ${ }^{\circ} \rho a$

 heard in her own defence: she pleads that her very existence is endangered (xi), that Socrates above all Athenians owes her even more than filial obedience and regard (xim-xiv), finally, after a brief reply to the arguments of Crito (xv), she concludes by holding out to Socrates a prospect of rewards in the
${ }^{1}$ Cron's remark on this passage is true, but not (I think) the whole truth: "Dabei wird man an die Sitte zu Athen erinnert, dass, wenn es sich um Abschaffung eines Gesetzes handelte, dieses durch erwählte Anwälte ( $\sigma v v \dot{\eta} \gamma{ }^{\prime} \rho o \iota$ ) vertheidigt wurde.'
other world, at the same time reiterating her own





Enough has now been said to establish what is I think a clear analogy between the structure of our dialogue and the circumstances of Socrates' trial: but in order to obtain an accurate comprehension of the meaning of the verdict delivered by Socrates, it is necessary to inquire somewhat more particularly into the position assigned to Crito and to the Laws. Crito is not merely the friend of Socrates, pleading with passionate earnestness against the sacrifice of the associate whom he held so dear: he is also the mouthpiece of Athenian public opinion. This is clearly implied in the arguments by which he endeavours to induce Socrates to make his escape: "many men," he says in 44 в, "who do not know you and me well, will think me guilty of neglect, because I might have saved you, if I had been willing to spend money": and again in 45 E , "I for my part feel ashamed for you and for us who are your friends. It will be thought that the whole of this thing which has befallen you is due to our cowardice, I mean your appearance in court when you need not have appeared, the process itself, and last of all, the crowning absurdity of the whole transaction, that you should be thought to have given us the slip through a sort of cowardice and unmanliness upon our part, because we did not save you and you did not save yourself, when it was possible and practicable for you to do so, if we had been good for anything at all." Had Socrates complied with the invitation of his
friend, not only would no Athenian have condemned him, but to the mass of his countrymen his conduct would have appeared not only natural, but perfectly just: the ties of friendship were stronger in their estimation than those of patriotism. Speaking of the reproaches which he would have to endure for leaving Socrates to die, Crito asks in 44 C : "what character could be more dishonourable than the character of preferring one's money to one's friends? The people will never believe that it was you who refused to escape, and we who were anxious to save you." The concluding part of Crito's appeal is even more emphatic: "And besides, Socrates, I think you are trying to do what is zrong, betraying yourself, when you might be saved ( 45 C )." Crito is throughout the representative of average Athenian morality, and from the fact that he nowhere recognises the paramount duty which both Socrates and he as surety for his friend owed to the State, we can see how lightly the yoke of patriotism pressed upon an age that produced a Theramenes and an Alcibiades.

Let us now examine the part played by the Laws in the dialogue. It is easy to go wrong here: for that which is acquitted by Socrates is not the verdict or sentence which the unjust judges had pronounced against him: Socrates indeed declares again and again throughout the dialogue that his condemnation was flagrantly unjust. Nor yet is it strictly speaking the constitution of Athens in particular, for Socrates was far from viewing democracy with an altogether favourable eye: but what really stands arraigned before him is the State in the abstract as opposed to the Indivi-dual-in other words the principle that alone renders
possible the existence of any kind of State, aristocracy no less than democracy, the vó $\mu$ os ôs $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \grave{\alpha}$


We are now in a position to comprehend the full meaning of Socrates' decision. His acquittal of the State is at once a condemnation of his judges and a counter-accusation of High Treason against the people themselves. For if the State was innocent, the guilt rested with the judges, who had misinterpreted the law : and the postponement of public interests to the apparent advantage of the individual, which forms the very pith and marrow of Crito's appeal, is shewn to be just as treasonable as Socrates himself was patriotic.

Up to this point we have been concerned chiefly with the form of the dialogue : it remains to consider the doctrine. We shall find that both in respect of ethical and political teaching the Crito remains true to the creed of the historical Socrates. This is exactly what we should expect beforehand, if the real purpose of Plato, as I have endeavoured to shew, was to hurl back the charge of High Treason from the Socrates of history upon the Athenians at large.

We note first of all the peculiarly Socratic method which is employed throughout the inquiry. The entire dialogue is but an illustration of the precept which is



 to speak the major premise of Socrates' practical syllogism, of which the minor is established by the plead-

## ${ }^{1}$ See note in loc.

ing of the Laws ( 50 A foll.). The historical accuracy of our dialogue is apparent in its ethical doctrine no less than in its method. We seem to hear the voice of Socrates when we read that only the wise man's judgment is deserving of regard (47 A), and still more when we find this statement backed up by the familiar illustrations from the arts ( 47 в foll.): nor is the conception of wickedness as a disease of the soul, and the preference of soul over body ( 47 E foll.), out of harmony with Socrates' teaching. Equally Socratic is
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \tau \grave{\iota} \epsilon \hat{v} \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu v$ : and the refusal in 49 E to permit any divergence between theory and practice is only the ovó̇єis é éciv á $\mu a \rho \tau \alpha ́ v \epsilon \iota$ stripped of its paradox. I think also that Socrates would have willingly accepted the fundamental $\lambda$ ó $\gamma o s$ of the dialogue- $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon v i ̀ \tau \rho o ́ \pi ~ \oplus ~ a ́ d \iota-~$ $\kappa \eta \tau$ є́ov єival-even if he never actually so expressed himself. The objections raised by Zeller and many editors, on the ground of passages in Xenophon and Aristotle ${ }^{1}$, seem to be directed rather against the apparent altruism of such a doctrine than at the doctrine itself. But in the mouth of Socrates the sentiment, so far from being altruistic, was dictated by conscious egoism. He refrained from doing wrong, not out of regard for others, but because of its effect upon his own soul: for just in proportion as the value of our
${ }^{1}$ In Mem. II. 6. 35 all that Socrates says is that if Critobulus believes that virtue in a man is $\nu \iota \kappa a ̂ \nu \tau o u ̀ s ~ \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \quad \phi i \lambda o u s ~ \epsilon \hat{v}$ тоooûvтa, тov̀s $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \chi \chi \theta \rho o u ̀ s ~ к а к \omega ิ s, ~ h e ~ w i l l ~ n o t ~ f i n d ~ i t ~ h a r d ~ t o ~ m a k e ~$ friends. Mem. III. 9. 8 proves nothing either way. In Aris-

 каi какшิs) it seems to me that Socrates is only making use of a popular definition of $\ddot{v \beta \rho \iota}$ to illustrate his own.
souls exceeds that of our bodies ${ }^{1}$, is the supreme importance of keeping them healthy and free from stain, if we would consult our own individual interests. Rightly understood, this thorough-going vindication of virtuous conduct even under the extremest provocation is altogether in harmony with a creed which regarded soul as the true self, and self-knowledge and self-development as the end of life.

The political teaching of the Crito faithfully represents the opinions held by Socrates and establishes his right to the title of patriot, in contrast to his fellowcountrymen. Whether we regard the decision itself, or the grounds by which it is enforced, the whole political bearing of the dialogue may be summed up in the words which Xenophon puts into the mouth of
 iv. 4. 12). To break the laws is to strike at the root of all society ( 50 A ): it is not merely a breach of contract (5I E), it is State-murder, a crime worse than matricide ( $50 \mathrm{~B}, 5 \mathrm{I}$ A foll.), because our country is far more to us than a mother. What an emphatic assertion of the old Greek theory of life is here! The very man whose daily work it was to preach self-study and self-knowledge proclaims that we should live for the State rather than for ourselves. Nor if we view the question rightly is there any contradiction. Socrates refused to separate the $\beta$ ios $\pi \rho а к \tau \iota к$ ós from the $\beta$ ios $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s$; he claimed to be a political as well as a moral reformer: oi ${ }^{i} \mu \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \lambda i ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ 'A $\begin{aligned} & \eta \nu \nu a i ́ \omega \nu \text {, he says }\end{aligned}$


[^2]$\theta \hat{\omega}$ s $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \tau \kappa \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \in \chi \nu \eta$ каі $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \tau a ̀ ~ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\alpha} \mu o ́ v o s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\nu \hat{v} \nu\left(52 \mathrm{IE}\right.$ ). He exhorted the Athenians $\dot{\alpha} \phi^{\prime}$ ' $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau i ́ a s$ "̈ $\rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa a \theta a i \rho \epsilon \iota v \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$-to reform the State by reforming themselves: and, conversely, he believed that the full development of the individual could only be attained in the service of the State. The only possible life as it appeared to Socrates was the life of a citizen. He condemned the increasing divergence between public and private interests in his day, and traced to this among other causes the decline of Athenian prosperity (Mem. III. 5. 21).

It may appear strange that a man so prone to doubt and inquiry should have hesitated to call in question the authority of the laws: but the fact is undeniable. Socrates would have agreed with the remark of Cleon in Thucydides (III. 37.4) oi $\mu \hat{\epsilon} v \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$

 whole life was distinguished by absolute fidelity to the laws of his country: he had upheld them against the fury of the people and the tyranny of the thirty: and now he consents to death rather than break them. It was for their strict subordination to law and authority that Socrates entertained so warm an admiration for Sparta and Crete: and the same feeling underlies the praise which he bestows in Xenophon upon the Athens of the past (Mem. III. 5). The generation before his birth appeared to him a kind of golden age, when the State flourished and the citizens were happy under the old unreflecting morality, where no right was known but that of law. The iimitation of Socrates' genius appears here. Had he carried out his principles to their fullest logical
development, he would not have shrunk from submitting to the test of his dialectic the whole question of the validity and authority of law, as a condition of the stability of social life : but to him it is almost an axiom that the law should be obeyed. The fact is that Socrates' rationalism was only half-complete. If reason presided over one hemisphere, $\mu a v \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ appeared to him to rule the other ${ }^{1}$. It was reserved for Plato to dethrone $\mu \alpha \nu \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ and make vous the sole monarch of the world ${ }^{2}$. But in Socrates' way of thinking, the Laws derive their validity from God, and have no need of human reason to establish it: they are of the same family with the Laws in the Unseen World, and he who offends against the one





The Crito therefore presents us with what is upon the whole a faithful picture of Socrates both as a man and as a teacher. Only in two respects does it appear to travel beyond the views which may with certainty be ascribed to him. While still in the vigour of life and possessed with the ardour of his mission, Socrates on no occasion expressed himself so despairingly about his country as we should infer
${ }^{1}$ See this admirably-worked out in Nohle's "Die Statslehre Platos in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung" (Jena, I880), pp. 10-13.
${ }^{2}$ In Politicus 209 C priests and soothsayers are placed on the same level with slaves, artisans and merchants.
${ }^{3}$ See also Xen. Mem. IV. 4. 25 каi $\tau$ oîs $\theta \in o i ̂ s ~ a ̉ p a, ~ \hat{\omega}$

from various passages in the Crito ${ }^{1}$ : on the contrary he thought the reformation of Athens quite within the range of practical politics (Xen. Mem. iII. 5). Nor would he have spoken of a future life so confidently as the Laws with his approval speak towards the close of the dialogue. But even here we must allow something for the influence which the imminent prospect of death might exert even upon the ardent spirit and sternly logical mind of a Socrates. On the whole I think it probable that his unjust condemnation may have led him to despair, not so much of Athens, as of the Athenians : but I cannot bring myself to believe that he could ever have dogmatically asserted or approved of the doctrine of immortality. Plato seems to be responsible for that.

In conclusion, let us endeavour to sum up the reasons which induced Socrates to remain and die. First and foremost, we may put the influence of his 'divine sign.' Although this is nowhere expressly mentioned in the Crito, yet there seems to be an allusion to it in the words with which the dialogue
 $\gamma$ єital. The very pleading of the Laws is but the voice of the divine sign made articulate: see my note

 rejection too of Crito's offer was the best possible refutation of the charge of treason, as it revealed Socrates in the light of a true patriot in the midst




of men, with whom private and personal interests weighed more than regard for their country and her laws. Nor must we forget, in the third place, that Socrates was now old, and had finished his mission: it was hardly possible to find a more opportune moment for dying. Had he been thirty and not seventy, I doubt if we should admire him so much: I think we should have thought him lacking in spirit. Plato in his place would probably have escaped, and I for one should not have blamed him. As it was, the death of Socrates was the best thing that could happen for his fame and influence: it was well worth while to die, if only for the sake of the impulse which his death imparted to the greatest of his pupils.

## KPIT $\Omega$.

[̂̀ тєрі̀ практє́oү. н̉өıкóc.]

## TA TOY $\triangle I A \Lambda O T O Y ~ П P O \Sigma \Omega \Pi A$

## $\Sigma \Omega K P A T H \Sigma, K P I T \Omega N$.

St. I.
43 I. $\Sigma \Omega$. T Tí т $\eta \nu \iota \kappa \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon ~ a ̉ \phi \imath ̂ \xi a \iota, ~ \omega ̂ ~ K р i ́ \tau \omega \nu ; ~ そ ̀ ~ o u ̉ ~$ $\pi \rho \grave{\varrho}$ 'ै $\epsilon \tau \iota$ є̇ $\sigma \tau i \nu$;

KР. Пávv $\mu$ èv oỉv.
$\Sigma \Omega$. Пŋขíка $\mu$ а́льбта;
KP. " ${ }^{\prime} \rho \theta \rho o s \beta a \theta \dot{v}{ }^{\prime}$.

Crito visits Socrates in prison.
'To-day, Socrates, the ship will return from Delos, and to-morrow you must 5 die.' тov̂ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \omega \tau \eta \rho i o v ~ \phi u ́ \lambda a \xi ~ i ́ \pi a \kappa о \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$.

 є่ $\mu о \hat{v}$.
$\Sigma \Omega . \quad{ }^{\prime} А \rho \tau \iota \delta \grave{\text { ® }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \varsigma \bar{\eta} \pi a ́ \lambda a \iota ;$
KP. 'Е $\pi \iota \epsilon \iota \kappa \hat{\varsigma} \pi \alpha{ }^{2} \lambda a \iota$.
 б८ү!̂ таракáӨ $\quad \sigma a \iota$;






 aùtท̀v каї тра́шs фє́ $\rho \in \iota \varsigma$.




 สบ่าๆ.
 з० $\dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\imath} \xi a \iota$;













[^3] $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \tau o \iota ~ o i ̉ \mu a \iota ~ \ddot{\eta} \xi \epsilon \iota \nu$ av̉тò $\tau \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$.

КР. | ПóӨє $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ тои̃то тєкцаіिєє;






 $\mu \epsilon$.






 Кріт $\omega \nu$.



 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma$ 人l
 2.T 295 ,





 $\sigma a \varsigma ~ a ̉ \pi \iota \epsilon ́ \nu a \iota ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \delta \epsilon ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \pi \rho \circ \theta \nu \mu o v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$.


 $\pi \rho a \hat{\chi \theta a \iota, ~} \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{a} \nu \pi \rho a \chi \theta \hat{\eta}$.

 таро́vта $\nu v \nu i ́$, ＂̈тє oioí $\tau$＇єi大ì oi mo入入oì ov̀ $\tau a ̀$ $20 \sigma \mu \iota \kappa о ́ т а \tau а ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa а \kappa \omega ิ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \xi є \rho \gamma a ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，à $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ тà $\mu \epsilon ́-$


 $\kappa a i ̀ ~ a ̉ \gamma a \theta a ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a, ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \kappa a \lambda \omega ิ s ~ a ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon i ̉ \chi \epsilon \nu \cdot \nu \hat{v} \nu ~ \delta \grave{~}$




Your friendsare willing to run the risk of saving you； indeed the risk is but small．
 $\pi \rho о \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa a i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \not \partial \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ є่ $\pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \epsilon i ́ \omega \nu, \mu \dot{\eta}$,








 ä入入a $\pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ́$.
















 $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \kappa а \tau a ̀$ Єєтта入íav.



 бov $\sigma \pi \epsilon \cup ́ \sigma a \iota \in ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon \kappa a i ̀ ~ \epsilon ै \sigma \pi \epsilon ย \sigma a \nu ~ \sigma \epsilon ̀ ~ \delta \iota a-$
 тov̀s viєîs tov̀s баvтov̂ é $\mu \circ \iota \gamma \in$ ठокєîs $\pi \rho о$ -

Besides it is wrong, even cowardly, to die when you might live. Think of your children and your 5 friends: we shall be branded as cowards for our share in this whule matter.'



 viaıs $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ o ́ \rho \phi a \nu o u ́ s . ~ \grave{\eta} \gamma a ̀ \rho$ oủ $\chi \rho \grave{\eta} \pi о \iota \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota$






















> 'Crito, the only $\underset{\text { regarding }}{\substack{\text { opinions } \\ \text { are }}}$ regarding are those of the wise. Is it, not so?' 5
 $\epsilon i \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta$, "̈ $\sigma \omega \mu \epsilon i \zeta \omega \nu$, тобov́т $\omega \quad \chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega$ -
































 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \tau a \iota$;

KP. K $a \lambda \omega \rho$.
 $\nu \eta \rho a ̀ s ~ \mu \eta$;

KP. Nail.
$\Sigma \Omega$. X $\quad$ П $\sigma \tau a i$ oc out $\chi$ ai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \rho o \nu i ́ \mu \omega \nu, \pi o \nu \eta \rho a i ̀$ ठè $a i ̂ \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ ả申 $\rho o ́ v \omega \nu$;

KP. $\Pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma \delta^{\prime}$ ova";

 то́тє $\rho о \nu \pi а \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ є ̇ \pi a i ̀ \nu ~ к а і ~ \psi о ́ \gamma \varphi ~$



KP. 'Elò̀s uóvov.
$\Sigma \Omega$. Оن̀кии̂̀ фоßєîज val $\chi \rho \grave{\eta}$ тov̀s
'As in gymnastics, so in questons of right and wrong: we should regard, not the opinions of the many, but only his who knows. Otherwise that within us which is concerned with
right and wrong will be destroyed:

 Io $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$.

KP. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$.





KP. "Ебтє таи̂тa.


 20 какò $\pi \epsilon і$ í $\epsilon \tau а \iota$;

KР. П $\omega$ s $\gamma \alpha \grave{\rho}$ ov̉;
 каì єis $\tau i ́ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau о \hat{v}$ à $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta$ ov̂vtos;

KP. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ óть єis тò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \cdot$ тои̂тo $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \delta \iota o ́ \lambda \lambda v \sigma \iota$.












 then. It is true, $\delta \delta o v s \delta_{\epsilon} \delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu \quad \delta \iota o \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \pi \epsilon \iota-$
 $\mathrm{E} \beta \iota \omega \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \hat{\eta} \mu \imath \imath \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \delta \iota \epsilon \phi \theta a \rho \mu$ évov av่тô ；life is not to be
 bought at any price．
KP．Naí．
 каі̀ $\delta \iota є \phi \theta a \rho \mu$ е́vov $\sigma \omega \prime \mu$ атоя；

KP．Ov̉ $\delta a \mu \omega \hat{\text { ．}}$






KP．Ơ̇ठaんஸ̂s．

KP．Полv́ $\gamma є$ ．








 кратєs．



 ả $\lambda \lambda a ̀ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon v ̉ ~ \zeta ̄ \eta \nu . ~$

KP．＇А入入à $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota$ ．

35
 є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu, \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \in \iota ~ ท ै ~ o v ̉ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota ;$

KP. Мévé.



This is the question we have to ask-is it right or is it wrong for me to make my 5 escape? With the consequences to you or to my children or myself, we are not concerned.
 $\nu a i ́ \omega \nu, \hat{\eta}$ ov̉ ठiкаьov• каì є́àv $\mu \not ̀ \nu ~ \phi a i ́-~$ $\nu \eta \tau a \iota$ ठі́каьоv, $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a, \epsilon i \quad \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta^{\prime}, \epsilon \in \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. $a ̈ \varsigma ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \sigma v ̀ ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ~ a ̀ \nu a-~$ $\lambda \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \omega \varsigma \chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \kappa a i ̀ \delta o ́ \xi \eta \varsigma \kappa a i ̀ \pi a i ́ \delta \omega \nu$





















 oìp.

KP. 'А $\lambda \lambda \grave{a} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ \sigma о \mu a \iota$.



 ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu \pi \rho о \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \quad \chi \rho o ́ \nu \varphi \omega \omega^{\prime} \mu о \lambda о \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \eta ; \geqslant \geqslant \pi a ̂ \sigma a \iota$





Do you still believe that we ought never to do wrong or evil to another, or requite wrong with wrong, or evil with evil? Think well before you answer: the adherents of this view cannot arguc with the many, who think otherwise.' 'I still believe it.'







KP. Фа $\mu$ ย́v.

KP. Oỉ $\delta \hat{\eta} \tau a$.


C KP. Oủ фаívetal.


$\Sigma \Omega$. Tí $\delta є ́ ; ~ a ̀ \nu т \iota к а к о ข р \gamma є i ̂ \nu ~ к а к \omega ̂ \varsigma ~ \pi a ́ \sigma \chi о \nu т а, ~$


KP. Ov̇ठaんஸ̂s.
 ảסıкєî̀ où $\delta$ èv $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota$.

KP. ' $А \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ '́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma$.













 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \kappa а i ̀ \delta i \delta a \sigma \kappa \epsilon, \quad \epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ є́ $\mu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ тоîs $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon$, тò $45 \mu \epsilon \tau$ à тои̂тo äкоиє.
 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon$.
$\Sigma \Omega$. $\Lambda$ '́ $\gamma \omega$ $\delta \grave{\eta}$ av̉ $\tau o ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o ̂ ̀ \tau o, ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \delta ' ~$



KР. Поıŋте́ov.

'And suppose the Laws of my country came and accused me of doing them wrong, what
5 should I say? Should I say they wronged me first?' 'Of course.'
$\theta \epsilon ́ \nu \delta \epsilon ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon i ̂ \varsigma \mu \eta े \pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \tau \eta ̀ \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu \mid \pi o ́-50$
$\tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ какผ̂s тıvas тоьov̂ $\mu \in \nu$, каі̀ таv̂та





























'They would reply: "The bargain was that you should obey us without any qualification, as our 5 child and slave. Persuasion you might bring to
bear upon us, but not force.



 тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau o v ̀ s ~ \gamma a ́ \mu o v s, ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \phi \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \iota ~ \omega i s ~ o v ̉ ~ к а \lambda \omega ิ s ~ \epsilon ै ́ \chi o v-~$ $\sigma \iota \nu$;' ov’ $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \phi о \mu a \imath, ~ \phi a i ́ \eta \nu ~ a ̈ \nu . ~ ' \alpha ̉ \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i} \tau \eta ̀ \nu$





















 ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \pi \rho \circ \gamma o ́ \nu \omega \nu$ á $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \iota \mu \iota \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o ́ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \sigma \tau \iota \nu ~ \dot{\eta} \pi a \tau \rho i \varsigma$
















KР. "Е $\mu о \iota \gamma є$ бокєіि.
XIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $\Sigma \kappa о ́ т є \iota ~ т о і ̈ \nu v \nu, ~ \omega ิ ~ \Sigma ผ ' к р а т є \varsigma, ' ~ ф а і ̂ є \nu ~$

 ठ $\rho \hat{a} \nu$ à $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ є̇ $\pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon i ̂ s . ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \gamma a ́ \rho ~ \sigma \varepsilon ~$ $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \eta^{\sigma} \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, є̇к $\theta \rho \in ́ \psi a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$,

To remain in Athens is a tacit promise to obey us: disobedience would be unfilial,
 ungrateful and 5 dishonest.

D ка入ف̂̀ $\sigma o \grave{~ \kappa a i ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda o \iota s ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \pi o \lambda i ́ \tau a \iota s, ~}{ }^{\circ} \mu \omega \varsigma$












 $\phi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ádıкєìv, öть тє $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \tau a i ̂ s ~ o v ̉ \sigma \iota \nu ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ ov่ $\pi \epsilon i ́ \theta \epsilon-$




 סє́тєра тоьєî.


In your case, Socrates, the bargain is particularly binding: no one has lived more constantly in A-
5 thens than you. Even during the trial you might have chosen exile rather than death.
































 $\ddot{\eta}$ о $\mu о \lambda о \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$;

 тро̀s $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ a v ̇ \tau o u ̀ s ~ к а i ̀ ~ o ́ \mu o \lambda o \gamma i ́ a s ~ \pi a \rho a \beta a i \nu e \iota s, ~ o v ̉ \chi ~$





 ov̉ $\delta \epsilon \mu i a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ' $E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu i ́ \delta \omega \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ oủ $\delta$ è $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta a \rho \beta a \rho t-+5$
 $\tau \epsilon \kappa а i ̀ ~ \tau v \phi \lambda o i ̀ ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ o i ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda о \iota ~ a ̀ \nu a ́ т \eta \rho o \iota ~ o u ̋ \tau \omega ~ \sigma o \iota ~ \delta \iota a-~$





 $\mu a \rho \tau a ́ \nu \omega \nu$ тє тоúт $\omega \nu$ тí ảjaӨòv є’ $\rho \gamma a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota$

 $\tau \eta$ そ́ $\epsilon \iota \circ \iota ~ к а i ̀ ~ a u ̉ \tau o i ̀ ~ \phi \epsilon u ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$



By making your escape, you will endanger yourfriends. And whither will you flee? Wherever 5 you go, suspicion and ridicule await you. Your children too will suf-
 escape than by your death.







 тás $\tau \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu о \mu о \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a ̉ \nu \delta \rho \omega ̂ \nu ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~$







































It is well for you to die now, in view both of this present world and of the next. Do not let Crito per-5
suade you."















 what I seem to hear them saying. Have you anything more to urge?' 'No-
5 thing.' Then directs.'










## NOTES.

 dialogue generally has two or even three titles: the Bodleian ms for example denotes the other three members of the first Tetralogy by the names Eú $\theta \dot{v} \phi \rho \omega \nu$ グ $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ó $\sigma i o v . \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s$, 'A $\pi о \lambda о \gamma i a \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau o u s$. $\dot{\eta} \theta \iota \kappa \dot{\prime} s, \Phi a i \delta \omega \nu \ddot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$. $\dot{\eta} \theta \iota \kappa o ́ s$. In each case only the first of these titles dates from Plato, who generally (but not always) named the dialogue after one of the characters appearing in it. The second title was added by Thrasylus, a rhetorician and literary critic who flourished about the Christian era: it is intended to explain the subject treated of in the dialogue. It is not clear whether the third title was added, as Grote believes (Plato Vol. I. p. 160), by Thrasylus, or by Diogenes Laertius either on his own responsibility or in obedience to some other authority (see Diog. Laert. III. 49); at all events it is meant to indicate the formal scope of the dialogue -whether a dialogue of exposition ( $\dot{u} \phi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \iota \kappa \delta s^{s}$, of which $\dot{\eta} \theta \iota \kappa o ́ s$ is a subdivision), or a dialogue of search ( $\zeta \eta \tau \eta \tau \iota \kappa \delta \delta s$ ). Here the Crito is correctly described as an ethical dialogue dealing with a question
 $\pi \rho \alpha \kappa \tau \epsilon \in \circ \nu$ єíтє $\mu \eta$ )-viz. is it right to save one's life by breaking the law?

Crito was one of Socrates' oldest and most attached friends (Apol. 33 D, Phaedo ir5 A foll.). He appears to have been rich and not indisposed to make more money (Euthyd. 304 C ). The fact that he had stood surety for Socrates after the trial (Phaedo 115 D) increased his personal danger if Socrates should escape from prison, and reveals in a yet stronger light his devotion to his friend : see note cn 45 D. "Plato's picture of Crito is as of a sensible and kindly man of the world, looking upon life from the point of view of an honest Athenian gentleman, but without any capacity for philo-sophy".-Archer-Hind's Phaedo p. 42.

The scene is in the prison, just before daybreak.

## CHAPTER I.

Crito warns Socrates that the ship is on its way back from Delos, and will arrive to-day.
 $=$ ' of this sort' )( roios ' of that sort'. The distinction is like that between ö $\delta \epsilon$ and oì oís. rqviкa seems to have been originally a Doric adverb ( $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu 0 s$ is Doric for $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \nu o s$ ): the suffix reappears in aúr-iка.
2. $\pi \rho \oplus \dot{\text {. }}$. Socrates is not surprised to see Crito, for we learn from the Phaedo (59D, cf. Xen. Mem. IV. 8. 2) that he was daily visited by his friends during the interval between his condemnation and his death: but he is surprised to see him so early. The prison was generally opened somewhat later ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \notin \varphi^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \tau 0 \gamma$ 六 $\rho$ ov $\pi \rho \varphi^{\prime}$ Phaed. 1.c.). $\pi \rho \dot{\varphi}$ and not $\pi \rho \omega t$ is the correct Attic form of this word. The Bodleian has $\pi \rho \omega t$.
3. $\pi \alpha ́ v v \mu \grave{v} \nu$ oủv = 'imo, valde quidem' (Göbel). $\mu e ̀ v ~ o u ̂ \nu ~ i s ~ c o r-~$


4. $\pi \eta \nu i к \alpha ~ \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a . ~ \pi \eta \nu i ́ \kappa \alpha$ means 'at what precise time?' $\pi o ́ \tau \epsilon$ only 'at what time?' $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ makes the question more vague: 'About what o'clock is it?' So $\tau i \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ;=q u i d$ potissimum? Gorg. 448 D.

 is the morning twilight, and $\beta a \theta$ ús implies that it was more dark


 'I wonder how it was that etc.': $\theta a v \mu a ́ \xi \omega$ $\epsilon i$ would mean 'I wonder that'. Infra $\sigma o t-\dot{v} \pi \alpha \kappa о \hat{\sigma a l}=$ 'to let you in': ن́такоv́єı is often used of answering the door: cf. Phaed. $59 \mathrm{E} \dot{\delta} \theta v \rho \omega \rho \dot{s} \delta \bar{\delta} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon i \omega \theta \epsilon \epsilon$. $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \kappa о v \in \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\dot{\dot{v}} \dot{v} \pi \alpha \kappa о \dot{v} \sigma \alpha s$ of the porter in Xen. Symp. I. Iı.
 met in the $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \circ \nu$, which adjoined the prison (Phaed. 59 D ), and waited till the prison was opened.
9. єv่ทpүє́тทтal. Where initial єن̉- or oi- precede a vowel in Attic verbs, "that vowel, and not the initial diphthong, receives the
 (Rutherford, New Phrynichus, p. 245). " $\tau i$ is equivalent to $\epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \rho$ -
$\gamma \epsilon \sigma i a \nu \tau \iota \nu \grave{a}(\mathrm{a} \mathrm{tip)"} \mathrm{Dyer}. \mathrm{каi-каl} \mathrm{above} \mathrm{is} \mathrm{'and} \mathrm{also.'} \mathrm{[B} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{the}$ editors ${ }^{1}$, except Kral, read $\left.\epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \notin \eta \tau a \iota.\right]$


13. єîta. On $\epsilon i \tau a$ indignabundum see Apol. 28 в ( $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\imath \tau}$ ’ oủk 43 в aiбхи́vєı;) and my note there. For єita followed by $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ cf. (with
 $\delta i \delta \omega s \lambda a \beta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$;
 wish that I myself were not so sleepless and sorrowful'. ov does not anticipate the following ouvó́ in oú $\delta^{\prime}$ àv $\nu$ aútós (ne ipse quidem), but is part of Crito's reply to Socrates' question, since $\epsilon i \tau \alpha-\pi a \rho a \kappa \alpha ́-$ $\theta \eta \sigma \alpha \iota=\dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v} s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \rho a l \mu \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma \iota \gamma \hat{\eta} \pi a \rho a \kappa a \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. For the displacement of $\tau \epsilon$ Stallbaum compares Phaed. 94D $\tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu$ каi $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ iaтрıкй $\nu$. Wohlrab takes ov̉ as merely anticipatory of the following negative: I agree with Göbel.
${ }^{17}$. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кal $\left.\sigma 0 \hat{1}-\theta a v \mu \alpha^{\prime}\right\} \omega$ sc. just as you were lately surprised, supra 43 A $\theta a v \mu a ́ \xi \omega$ ö $\pi \omega s \kappa \tau \lambda$. For $\theta a v \mu \alpha ́ \xi \omega$ with gen. see Goodwin's Greek Grammar p. 222. Cron on the other hand takes à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \kappa a i$ as $=$ 'but furthermore', while Göbel connects каi $\theta a \nu \mu a ́ j \omega$ with кal ov̉к グ $\gamma \epsilon \iota \rho \circ \nu$ in the next line-' both-and '.
18. oúk $\eta$ ้ $\epsilon\llcorner\rho o v$. The rest of Crito's reply to Socrates' $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ oủk $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v} s \dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ s ~ \mu \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$. By using the conjunctive $\delta \iota a ́ \gamma \eta$ ns where at first sight we should expect the optative $\delta$ oa $\gamma o{ }^{\circ}$ in the next line, Crito contrives to indicate that he still wishes Socrates $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\eta} \dot{\eta} \delta \sigma \tau a$

 av่ $\hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\delta} \mu_{0} \lambda o \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$. In Apol. 40 D Socrates declares that nothing is ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \circ \nu \kappa \alpha i \geqslant \eta \delta \iota \nu$ than sound dreamless sleep.
 in Rep. v. 464 в.
20. $\eta$ ú $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ v \iota \sigma a$ тov̂ трóтov. Inscriptions of the age of Plato shew that verbs beginning with $\epsilon \dot{v}$ - regularly had an augment in the secondary tenses: see Rutherford New Phryn. 244 and Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften 78. Here the mSS and edd. (except Kral) read $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a \iota \mu b \nu \iota \sigma a$. On the genitive with $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a \iota \mu o \nu \zeta \xi \epsilon \iota \nu$ compare Goodwin's Greek Grammar p. 224: and for the sentiment
${ }^{1}$ By "the editors" I mean Cron, Schanz, Wohlrab, Göbel and Kral : see Pretace.
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \delta \sigma^{\prime} \omega \nu$.

24. т $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ıкоиิтоข övтa. Socrates was seventy years of age: v. infra $5^{2} \mathrm{E}$.
$43 \mathrm{C} \quad$ 26. $\mathfrak{a} \lambda$ ( $\sigma$ кovtal $\grave{\epsilon} \nu=$ 'are overtaken by' (Church). In this sense $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ more often takes the dative without $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$.
 them from being indignant'. Verbs of hindering, if negative themselves, are regularly followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oú with the infinitive, which may or may not have the article. Goodwin MT. 198 foll. With the present example compare Rep. I. 354 В oủк $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \sigma \chi$ б́ $\mu \eta \nu \tau \grave{\partial} \mu \grave{\eta}$ oủк—
 ov่ $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$ ári $\mu \omega \mathrm{s} \kappa \tau \lambda$. Whitelaw (Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society III. I, p. 41 foll.) endeavours, I think with success, to prove that both negatives have a value, the infinitive being consecutive. Thus while $\epsilon \in \kappa \dot{\lambda} \lambda v \sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu=$ 'he hindered
 not hinder me, so that I did not refrain-from-speaking' i.e. keep silence (oủk єiT€îv).
 K $\rho i \tau \omega \nu$; on $\pi \rho \varphi \varphi^{\prime} \mathrm{v}$. note ibid.
34. Є̇v тoîs $\beta$ apútata. Note the climax: $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \eta \eta^{\nu}-\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\kappa \alpha i l \beta a \rho \in i ̂ a \nu-\epsilon ̇ \nu \tau o i ̂ s ~ \beta a \rho u ́ \tau a \tau a$. The phrase $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau o i ̂ s a d d s$ emphasis to the superlative. When occurring with the superlative of adjectives, it is best explained by supplying a fresh superlative to agree with the article: this superlative is sometimes expressed, e.g. Cratyl.
 but Schanz rejects $\left.\mu \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \sigma \tau o s\right)$ : compare also the kindred expression in Symp. 195 E $̇$ é $\nu \mu a \lambda \alpha \kappa \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau o \iota s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu a \lambda \alpha \kappa \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$. When as here the phrase is linked to an adverb, we must repeat the superlative along with a participle supplied from the verb to which the adverb

 become purely adverbial and may be used even with feminine adjectives, as in the well-known $\grave{\epsilon} \nu$ roîs $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau a \iota ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \nu \eta \bar{\epsilon}$ III. 17 , where see Classen's note. Compare Kühner, Griechische Grammatik II. 27.
 my note on Apol. 26 в. The annual mission to Delos, during
which no criminal was put to death at Athens, had begun the day before Socrates' trial, when the priest of Apollo decorated the bow of the vessel with garlands. On this occasion the boat was absent thirty days. The mission was intended to commemorate the deliverance of Athens under Theseus from the annual tribute of young men and maidens sent to Crete: see Phaed. 58 A foll. and Xen. Mem. IV. 8. 2.
36. $\tau \in \theta v a ́ v a l ~ i s ~ s l i g h t l y ~ m o r e ~ e m p h a t i c ~ t h a n ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ : see
 The infinitive $\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ is hardly used by good Attic prose writers, $\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \nu \eta \eta^{\sigma} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ being used instead: but $\tau \epsilon \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha, \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ are alone right, never $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \tau \epsilon \in \nu \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$, $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$. Rutherford Babrius p. 36 .
37. ov̋ тol $\delta \eta े$ áфîkтat = 'no, it is true that it has not arrived'. 43 D

 as with the Latin videri, the personal construction is generally preferred: if we follow Schanz $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \mu^{\prime} \nu \nu o \iota$ is to be taken as an infinitive used absolutely='in my opinion': cf. Ar. Aves 1235

 and the common phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu \in \mathfrak{\imath} \nu \alpha \iota$. The construction $\delta о \kappa є \hat{\imath} ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu ~ \mu o \iota ~$ $\ddot{\eta} \xi \in \iota$ though rare is also allowable: see Phaed. 108 D $\dot{\delta}$ ßios $\mu$ o
 Schanz, Novae Commentationes p. 130) Menex. 236 в ӧтє $\mu$ оь бокє $\hat{\imath}$ $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \tau i \theta \epsilon \iota \tau$ тò $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \alpha ́ \phi \iota o \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu:$ see also infra on 50 в. For $\mu \in \in ้ \nu$ (after $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ) without a following $\delta \epsilon$-a frequent idiom in a clause with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, the antithesis to which is really contained in the preceding negative clause-compare (with Stallbaum) Prot. 344 A oủ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ єîva $\iota$, ả $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \hat{\prime} \nu$ ध́ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.
 (Fischer). Cape Sunium was the great landmark for seamen on the South coast of Attica.
 'news' (nuntii) is not found before Polybius. $\epsilon \kappa$ before ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ is like $\epsilon \kappa$ of the agent (conceived of as the source) after passive verbs, e.g. Tim. 47 в $\delta \omega \rho \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$. Wohlrab and Kral read $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \omega \hat{\omega}$ with some MSS: Cron, Schanz and Göbel bracket $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$, on the ground that $\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ cannot $=\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \omega \hat{\omega}$, and that $\epsilon \in$ to express the source must be followed by a neuter or inanimate object: but the example I have cited is enough to defend the idiom.

## CHAPTER II.

Socrates relying on a vision declares that the ship will not arrive till to-morrow.

1. тúxn $\alpha, \gamma a \theta \hat{n}$ sc. $\epsilon$ in =quod bene vortat: 'I pray that it may be for the best'. The formula is frequent on inscriptions and


 $\phi i \lambda o \nu, \tau a u ́ \tau \eta$ è $\sigma \tau \omega$ compare the last words of the dialogue:

44 A 5. Tท̂ $\gamma \alpha \rho \operatorname{\pi ov}$. This is the introductory $\gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho\left(\gamma^{\prime} a p a\right)$ and should not be translated: see on Apol. 20 E Xaı $\rho \in \phi \hat{\omega \nu \tau a} \gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ${ }^{\text {i } \sigma \tau \epsilon} \pi \pi$.
2. $\dot{\sim} \sigma \tau \epsilon p a i a-\eta$ " $\hat{\eta}$. " $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \rho a i n$ et $\dot{\eta} \dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a i a$ perpetuo usu rle diebus dicuntur, omisso semper $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a-\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ et $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \rho a$ de aliis rebus quibuslibet repetitis, concione, proelio etc." Cobet, Variae Lectiones 246. The words are often confused with one another in MSS. $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a i a$ being a virtual comparative is followed by $\eta$. Note the orthography in $\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ : the $\iota$ is found in B here and infra 46 D and $4^{8} \mathrm{D}$ : inscriptions also furnish evidence to the same effect: see Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften p. 86. $\theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$ is connected with $\theta \in i \nu \omega$, фóvos, Skt. han: the ending -iбк $\omega$ is probably on the analogy of $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho-i \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota$ and the like. Compare Gust. Meyer, Griech. Gr. ${ }^{2}$ pp. 259, 45 I.
3. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \tau 0\left\llcorner\delta \eta^{\prime} . \quad \gamma^{\prime} \tau 0 \iota=\right.$ ' at all events'.
oi $\tau$ оúт $\omega \nu$ кúpıo viz. oi $\notin \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$, the board of eleven (ten ordinary members and a $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon u$ s) who had general charge of the prisons and saw that the capital sentence was carried out: Phaed. 59 E, i 16 в foll.
 or that which was just beginning. Soph. О. T. 781 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ov̂̃a $\nu$
 $\chi$ ov. From Phaedo 59 D-E it appears that Socrates was right: the boat did not arrive till the second day.
4. тaúтŋร $\tau \eta ̂ S$ vukтós: genitive of time within which: Goodwin, Gk. Gr. 227.
II. Kıvסvvéés in the sense of סoкєîs: so frequently in conversational style.
ċv kaıp⿳⺈ $\tau \iota v \iota$ 'peropportune' (Stallbaum). $\tau \iota s$, as Cron re-

 tion: compare 43 в каi $\grave{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} s \sigma \epsilon$ ov̉к $\eta_{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \iota \rho \circ \nu$.
5. ท̂v $\delta \dot{\text { è }} \delta \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ тò évútulov $=$ 'but about the vision-what was
 Socrates was greatly influenced by dreams and oracles and $\mu a \nu \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$

 story of this vision is also told (inaccurately) by Diogenes Laertius, II. 5. 35, and referred to in Cic. de Div. 1. 52. For two other examples see Phaed. 60 E and Diog. Laert. III. 5. In his respect for divination Socrates presents the most striking contrast to Plato, who places priestcraft and divination in the lowest of the three classes of arts distinguished in the Politicus ( 290 c foll.). See on this subject Nohle's excellent essay "Die Statslehre Platos in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung", Jena, I880.
 of white was significant of joy: compare Legg. xII. 947 B, where Plato in speaking of funerals ordains $\lambda \epsilon \cup \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \bar{\nu} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ Єै $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu$

 identified the vision with $\dot{\eta} \epsilon i \mu a \rho \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta$ : see Phaed. 115 A $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$

 $\Phi \theta i \eta \nu$ द́ $\rho i \beta \omega \lambda$ o $\boldsymbol{i}$ iкоí $\mu \nu \nu$, spoken by Achilles. It is possible (as Cron suggests) that the meaning of the line for Socrates lay partly in the fact that Phthia was the home of Achilles: but I feel sure that (rightly or wrongly) Socrates associated $\Phi \theta i \eta$ with $\phi \theta i \omega$ and $\phi \theta i \sigma \iota s$, and derived comfort from the epithet ' $\rho \rho i \beta \omega \lambda o \nu$. In Euripides' Electra 836 there is what seems to me a similar play upon the word $\Phi$ tias. Orestes has been dissecting a victim with a $\Delta \omega \rho \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \kappa о \pi i s$, in the presence of Aegisthus. Suddenly he lays it aside and exclaims:
 котi $\delta \alpha$; With this $\Phi \theta$ à̀s котis he slays Aegisthus. I am glad to find that Lambinus (as a pupil has pointed out to me) took the same view of $\Phi \theta i \eta \nu$ in this passage. See also infra on 47 B line 14 .
6. äтotov tò évúmviov. ஸ̀s äтotov tò évútviov is an inferior reading.
 above 43 A $\pi \alpha \nu \nu \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \cup \hat{\nu} \nu$.

## CHAPTER III.

Crito entreats Socrates to escape and save the reputation of his friend.
 address in Athenian society. The adjective meant originally 'more than human': in Homer it is generally used as an epithet of reproach, in Attic, of affection coupled with remonstrance (as here), or ironically. $\hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \rho \iota \epsilon$ is used in the same way. Other kindred expressions are $\hat{\omega} \beta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon, \hat{\omega} \not{a} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon, \hat{\omega} \lambda \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \hat{\omega} \theta a \nu \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota \epsilon$ : the three first mean 'my excellent friend' or 'my fine fellow' (ironical) : the last 'my dear sir' (with remonstrance). Often the precise shade of meaning can only be conveyed by the tone of the voice in translating aloud.
2. '̇tน kal vvิv. The words imply that Crito had already made many attempts to induce Socrates to escape : cf. infra 48 e $\pi a \hat{0} \sigma a \iota$


 collocation of present and aorist in $\pi \epsilon i \theta$ ov кai $\sigma \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \tau \iota$ cf. Gorg. 486 c where the MSS read $\dot{\epsilon} \mu o \grave{\imath} \pi \epsilon i \theta o v, \pi a \hat{v} \sigma a \iota \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ' \gamma \chi \omega \nu$.
3. ov̉ $\mu$ í $\alpha=$ non una = 'more than one'. The Bodleian has ov$\delta \epsilon \mu i a$ : but this can hardly be right. Crito proceeds to enumerate two misfortunes: the loss of his friend and the loss of his reputation. Observe that Crito thinks his reputation will suffer more if Socrates remains to die than if he breaks his own pledge to the Athenian people by inducing Socrates to escape: see Phaed. II5 D. In Crito's judgment (and Crito here as elsewhere represents the average Athenian gentleman of the day) it is a higher duty to serve one's friend than to be true to one's country. It is this point of view which Socrates combats in the sequel, as utterly fatal to the very existence of the State.
 Bodleian, which all the recent editors have changed. $\chi \omega$ pis is an adverb, as the balance between $\chi \omega \rho \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and $\notin \tau \iota \delta \epsilon$ proves (see also Madvig Adv. I. 369) : to regard it as a preposition makes it necessary either to insert $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ before $\sigma 0 \hat{v}$ (as Ast does), or to change $\sigma o \hat{u}$ to $\tau 0 \hat{\imath}$ with most editors. If we follow the mss, the construction is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ $\chi \omega \rho i s \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ (on the one hand) < $\dot{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{i} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu>\sigma o u ̂ \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a l$, roıoýtov
 second half of the antithesis because $\chi \omega \rho i s ~ \delta \epsilon$ would require кai
 this would be awkward, with $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ so far removed. For $\chi \omega \rho i s \mu^{\prime} \nu$ followed by $\chi \omega \rho i s \delta^{\prime}$ compare Parm. rзо в. There is however much to be said for reading $\tau o \hat{v}$, not $\sigma o \hat{0} \dagger$. Translate the whole sentence as it stancls thus: 'For to me your death is more than a single calamity: on the one hand, there is the loss of you, a friend such as I shall never find again, and moreover many men, who do not know you and me well, will think me guilty of neglect, because I might have saved you, if I had been willing to spend money'. $\dot{\omega}$ oiós $\tau^{\prime} \omega^{\prime} \nu$ is explanatory of $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$.
5. ̇̇бтєрฑ̂नӨal. $\sigma \tau \notin \rho \circ \mu a \iota$ and its kindred forms have two senses in Plato as in Attic generally: either 'I am debarred from', or 'I am deprived of': an example of the former meaning is Rep. vi.
 the latter cf. Phaed. II7 D oíou aं $\nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ \epsilon ่ \tau \alpha i \rho o u ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ os єỉ $\nu$.
 is of course future. ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with the future indicative (rare), or (far more often) the aorist conjunctive (cf. infr. 46 c ó $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \iota \xi \nu \gamma \chi \omega \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \omega)$, is a strong negative : for the sense of futurity in the aorist conjunctive compare $\pi i-0-\mu \alpha \iota$, $\begin{gathered}\text { e } \delta-o-\mu a \iota \\ \text { (conjunctives with the short vowel as in }\end{gathered}$ $\left.\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} i-o-\mu \epsilon \nu\right)$ and perhaps Latin faxo, i.e. fac-s-o: see my note on Apol. 29 D and compare Goodwin MT. p. 184.
7. oî- $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ไ $\sigma \alpha \sigma \iota v$. Not oi-ov because the clause is virtually conditional: no one who knew Crito and Socrates well could imagine that Crito had treated him with neglect.
 'I might have saved you'. This clause is explained by $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ : it was because Crito had the money, and didn't use it, that ignorant men might charge him with neglect: had he been penniless, he would have escaped the charge. Crito was very well off: see Eu-

+ This view is taken by Otto Apelt in a review of my first Edition in the 'Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift' for Dec. 15, 1888.
thyd. 304 C. Cron and Göbel take $\dot{\omega}$ to mean 'although': so Schanz in Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien, Vol. 20 (1869) p. 87, comparing the concessive use of $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon$ or $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon-\gamma \epsilon$ in Prot.

 only in the modern idiom that even this use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon}$ is concessive: to the Greeks it was causal, 'for, as for the many, they etc.' Note the iota subscript in $\sigma \hat{\omega}_{\zeta}^{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ : it is regularly found in the present stem of this verb down to 160 b.c.: see Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften, p. 87.
 refers forward, not to $\delta о \kappa \epsilon i v$, but to $\ddot{\eta} \delta о к \epsilon i \nu$. For a similar case see

 physico, quam fieri quicquam sine causa dicere. For the repetition of $\delta$ окєî̀ after $\delta$ ó ${ }^{\xi} \alpha$ compare infr. 53 в $\beta \epsilon \beta a \iota \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \delta ı к а \sigma \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 himself very lofty views on the subject of friendship: see Mem. iI. 4. 5 каî $\tau о \iota \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi o \hat{\iota} о \nu \kappa \tau \eta ̂ \mu a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu a ̉ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \pi \alpha \rho a \beta a \lambda \lambda o ́ \mu \in \nu$ оs $\phi i \lambda o s \dot{a} \gamma a \theta$ òs oủk ä̀ $\pi о \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ крєітт $\omega \nu$ фaveí ; ibid. § I he censures the many for saying that a true and good friend is the best of all possessions, and yet caring more for money than for friends.

 opinion of the many is worthless, in comparison with that of the man who knows: see my introduction to the Apology p. x. and the passages there cited.

15. фpovtiלevy with a genitive, as often in Plato, e.g. Soph.

av่ $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is frequently used, without any expressed antecedent, for the matter under discussion, e.g. $46 \mathrm{C} \pi \hat{\omega} s$ ô̂v ä้ $\mu \in \tau \rho \iota \omega ́ \tau a \tau a$ бкотоí $\mu \in a$


16. av̇тà $\delta \grave{̇} \delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$. This use of aủrá throws light on aủrika (from $\alpha \dot{u} \tau \delta \delta$ ) in the sense of 'for example'. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \lambda(\mathrm{sc} . \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu)$ is passive :
 see thee, who thou art'. As to the omission of the copula it should be noted that Plato rarely leaves it out except in the present indicative ( $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ is more often omitted than $\epsilon \hat{\imath}$ or $\epsilon i \mu i)$, and in the present infinitive: see Schanz, Novae Commentationes Platonicae, p. 3 I foll.

2I. '́v av่тoîs $\delta เ a \rho \in \beta \lambda \eta \mu$ évos = 'falsely accused to them' (Church).
 $\zeta \eta \tau a \iota$, oü $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho$ кai $\epsilon \pi a l \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, i.e. it has reference to a court of law. With aúroís alone the phrase would mean 'at odds with them': $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ~ v ̇ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \delta \iota a \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v o s$ would be 'calumniated to them'.
 Compare our colloquial 'You ought to have been there'. $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i}$ in wishes is not to be explained by assuming an ellipse of the apodosis: it is more probable that $\epsilon l$ in conditional sentences is a later use, derived from the use of $\epsilon l=\sigma F \epsilon l$, cf. sei in Plautus and sī-c(e) to introduce a wish. See Monro's Honeric Grammar, p. 232 foll.
23. ₹va oioi $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu=$ ' that they might have been able '. iva, oon $\pi \omega$ s, etc. are used with a secondary tense of the indicative (without ${ }^{a} \nu$ ) in final clauses depending on a wish that can no longer be realised, or on the apodosis to an impossible protasis: see Goodwin MT. p. 72 . A similar rule holds for $\pi \rho i \nu$ and $\epsilon \omega s$ : Goodwin 145, 144. Scribes frequently misunderstand the idiom and corrupt the text either (a) by inserting ${ }^{\alpha} \nu$, or (b) by changing the indicatives to conjunctives or optatives: see Cobet, Variae Lectiones pp. 102, 359. Two passages, so far as I know, have not yet been emended. Marc. Aurelius,
 $\ddot{\imath \nu} \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\eta} \pi \dot{\alpha} \alpha \tau \tau \eta \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi i \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu a v ̉ \tau \hat{\psi}$, where read $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\eta} \nu$. The other

 where we should read $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \rho \alpha \dot{\xi} a s$ and possibly $\epsilon^{\xi} \xi \in \hat{\imath} \lambda \epsilon \nu$, unless the corruption in $\grave{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \in \lambda \eta$ lies deeper.
 the ${ }^{\circ} \nu \nu$ shews, but an independent clause.

The statement that a power to do harm implies the power of doing good rests on the Socratic doctrine that virtue is knowledge. If we know what is good, we are good, but we cannot know what is good without knowing what is evil (this Socrates proved by the analogy of the arts), and so being able to do what is evil: conversely, the power to do evil implies the power to do good. This is all worked out at length in the Hippias Minor (a genuine dialogue), where it is proved that the veracious man is $\dot{o} \delta v \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu 0 s \psi \in \delta \dot{\delta} \in \sigma \theta a l$ : see especially 366 в foll. and 369 в ( $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ oûv aī $\theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota$, ö $\tau \iota \dot{\alpha} \nu a \pi \epsilon \phi \phi \alpha \tau a \iota$

vûv $\delta \in \in=$ 'but as it is': see on Apol. 18 A and Prot. 335 C (quoted there) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \sigma v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu-\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta}$ oik
$\epsilon \theta \epsilon \epsilon$ ' $\lambda \epsilon \iota s \kappa \pi$. The Latin is 'nunc'. ov $\delta \dot{\delta} \tau \epsilon \rho a$ in the next line is probably adverbial as in Theaet. 184 A ( $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ) $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ ov́ $\delta \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \rho a$ i.e. neither
 be easy to supply $\dot{\epsilon} \xi_{\xi}^{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \gamma \alpha \dot{\beta} \xi \sigma \theta a \iota$.
 not mean 'they act wholly at random' (Church), as all the editors take it : had Plato meant that, he would have written $\pi \rho \alpha \tau \tau o v \sigma \iota$ as in

 is quite usual: cf. infra 5 r A. Translate: 'they treat a man just as it occurs to them '. Cf. Gorgias 52 I C à $\nu o ́ \eta \tau o s a ̈ \rho a \epsilon i \mu i, \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~K} \alpha \lambda \lambda i \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota s$,
 $\pi a \theta \in i \nu \nu$. Ibid. 522 C (which Stallbaum actually quotes to illustrate his view, as if $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ could be a passive to $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ as well as to
 means that 'the many' are altogether thoughtless in their treatment of the individual: witness the way in which Miltiades, Cimon and Pericles were treated (Gorg. 515 E-516 E). They would lightly put a man to death and just as lightly bring him to life again if they could: see infra $48 \mathrm{c} \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$, $\hat{\omega} \mathrm{K} \rho i \tau \omega \nu, \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \mu \mu a \tau a$ $\hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\rho} \dot{̣} \delta i \omega s \dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \tau \iota \nu \nu \cup ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \kappa \alpha i \dot{\alpha} \nu a \beta \iota \omega \sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu \gamma^{\prime}$ ä $\nu$, $\epsilon i$ oioi $\tau^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu, ~ o u ̛ \delta \epsilon \nu i \mathfrak{\xi u} \nu \nu \hat{\varphi}, \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$.

## CHAPTER IV.

In this chapter Crito urges Socrates not to let the fear of danger to his friends or exile to himself prevent him from absconding.
$44 \mathrm{E} \quad$ I. $\mu \grave{\mathrm{c}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \eta \eta^{\prime}$. This particle is regularly used to indicate that some topic is concluded. So at the end of speeches oi $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ ס̀̀ $\begin{aligned} \text { tav̂ra }\end{aligned}$
 between $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ retrospective and $\tau a ́ \delta \epsilon$ prospective.
 question more animated) merely indicates that a question is asked:
 expects the answer 'yes'. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ( $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ) can of course stand by itself in the sense of num? as ov in the sense of nonne?
3. $\pi \rho о \mu \eta \theta \in \hat{\imath}-\mu \eta^{\prime} . \quad \pi \rho о \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$ being virtually a verb of fearing is followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}$.

4．ci бvкофа́yтal＇the informers＇．The great part played by the law－courts and litigation in Athenian life caused a class of informers to spring up，resembling the＇delatores＇of the early Roman empire．The origin of the name is obscure ：see Liddell and Scott s．v．，where a suggestion of Mr Lancelot Shadwell is quoted， according to which the word originally means＇one who brings figs to light by shaking the trees＇：and then metaphorically＇one who makes rich men yield up their fruit by accusations and other vile


5．$\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \chi \omega \sigma เ \nu$ of a prolonged action ）（ $\alpha \nu a \gamma \kappa \alpha \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ of the act and nothing more．

6． $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\kappa \alpha} \boldsymbol{l}-\hat{\eta}-\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{i}=$ aut adeo－aut certe－aut etiam．
7．$\alpha \pi \sigma$ 及a入єîv is used both of voluntary and of involuntary



9．Síkaloí $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \in \nu=$＇it is right that we＇．The Greek idiom is 45 A personal while ours is impersonal．Goodwin MT．p．195．
 idiomatic expression $=$＇to refuse＇，＇to decline＇：Symp．i73 E $\mu$ ウ
 Aristoph．Aves $133 \kappa \alpha i \mu \eta \delta a \mu \omega \hat{s}{ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega s \pi o \iota \eta \quad \sigma \eta s$ ．The expression does not seem to occur except in prohibitions or entreaties with $\mu \eta$ ：see Schanz，Novae Commentationes Platonicae p．${ }^{25}$ ．

12．каi $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \pi \rho \circ \mu \eta \theta \circ \hat{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a}-\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha$ ．Socrates lets the Laws reply infra 53 в．

14．$\mu \cdot \eta^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \tau \operatorname{civ} \nu v$ ．Note the effective balance：каl $\tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \tau a-\kappa a l$ $\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda a \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha ́$ ，says Socrates：$\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon-\tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha-\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．says Crito． The second $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \epsilon$ is in 45 B ，line 24 ：Crito＇s earnestness has an inju－ rious effect upon his style：observe for example the recurrence of $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha$ within three lines just below．Wohirab takes a somewhat different view：＂Crito ut ipse hebetioris erat ingenii，ita oratio eius non nullis locis durior est minusque elegans＂．

кal $\gamma$ d̀ $\rho$ oú $\delta \dot{́}$＝neque enim．
I5．Oédovol．Even after a vowel Plato more frequently uses
 Symp． 190 D $\mu \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \lambda \omega \sigma \tau \nu$ ：Schanz Nov．Comment．Plat．p． 102.

17．тov́тovs тov̀s бukoфávтas．toúrous＝＇istos＇expresses con－ tempt：so very frequently in Greek：cf．Symp．18i e toútous roùs $\pi a \nu \delta i \not \mu o u s$ éparтás．Our English＇your＇is often used in the same way．

єv่тє $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mathbf{i s}=$ 'cheap': Crito contemptuously speaks of the informers as a commodity to be bought. We are told in the Memorabilia (II. 9) that Crito had himself suffered much from the бvкофávzą until following the advice of Socrates he engaged a vigorous but poor friend Archedemus to retaliate.
18. '̇ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ' av̉zoús = 'for them': there is much scorn in this phrase. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ in this sense is regularly used of inanimate objects ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ ' aúrò $\tau \circ \hat{\tau} \tau 0$ line 22): the idea implied in $\epsilon \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i$ is is therefore kept up.

 generally precede the word or phrase which they modify: cf. infr.
 $\pi \alpha ́ \nu v \kappa \alpha \tau a \phi \rho \circ \nu \omega \hat{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, and ibid. 462 A .

 фávzal, not of course for the loss of the money. Socrates did not think money a good nor the loss of it an evil, either in his own case or in that of his friends: see Apol. $3^{8}$ в, where he proposes the penalty of 30 minae, to be paid by Plato and Crito and others.
 фávtal. The pronoun ồtol is deictic: 'see! here are foreigners ready to spend theirs'. Crito in his animation speaks as if the ఢ̧́voc were actually present in the prison: "de degentibus in urbe quosque fere quotidie videbat quasi de praesentibus loquitur Crito"


 means 'in Athens'. There is a certain awkwardness in the collocation oû̀ol $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\delta}$ (for ovivoc implies $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon$ ): but it is not necessary to omit either of the two words. Crito is somewhat excited and prefers expressiveness to $\operatorname{logic}$ : see on 45 A line 14 above. The omission of the copula with éto七ио is common but not universal in
 Novae Comment. Plat. p. $35^{\circ}$

$\Sigma \mu \mu i$ as ó $\Theta \eta \beta$ aios - Ké $\beta \eta$ s. Simmias and Cebes (who was also a Theban) play a prominent part in the discussion about immortality in the Phaedo. See Archer-Hind's edition of the dialogue pp. 40-42.
23. «̈ $\lambda \lambda$ ol $\pi$ o $\lambda \lambda$ ol $\pi \alpha^{\prime} v v$. No doubt some or all of those named in Phaed. 59 B-C as present at the death of Socrates.
24. ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \omega$ : viz. supra line 14. In such phrases the present is preferred to the past: see on öт $\epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \omega$ Apol. 21 A.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о к а ́ \mu \eta s$. $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к а ́ \mu \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ is to give over from weariness: cf. infra
 sometimes absolutely (especially in phrases like Rep. IV. 435 D $\mu \grave{\eta}$ тoivvข áтока́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ à $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ бко́тєь: see Schanz, N. C. Pl. 25 note 2 ), sometimes with a participle: this seems to be the only passage where he has an infinitive following it, but cf. Eur. Ion ${ }^{1} 34^{-1} 35$ $\mu \circ \chi \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ oủк $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \omega$. Jacobs is here guilty of the solecism $\mu \cdot\rangle$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \nu \hat{\eta} s$, which is also printed by Schanz in his text.

 little to Crito that Socrates should be false to what was said in the excitement of his defence when he himself was ready to break his deliberate promise to the Athenian people: see above on 44 C line 3. On $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ with the 3 rd person of the Aorist Imperative see Goodwin MT. 181.
及ios $\epsilon \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. This shews that $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta \omega \dot{\omega} \nu$ refers to quitting Athens, not to quitting the prison.
27. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi^{\circ} \hat{v}-\alpha{ }^{2} \lambda \lambda o \sigma \epsilon$. We should expect ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \circ \theta_{l}: \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha-$ $\chi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$ would not mend matters, since $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \hat{a} \boldsymbol{y} \pi o l$ is not Greek. The
 is of course attracted to the following relative, as in $\beta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \in \hat{\imath} \theta \in \nu$ $\ddot{\sigma} \theta \epsilon \nu \pi \in \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \epsilon \iota$ in Soph. O. C. 1227.
28. cis Oetтa入íav. According to Diog. Laert. II. 5. ${ }^{25}$ So- 45 C crates declined invitations from Scopas of Crannon and Eurylochus of Larissa. The story that he refused an invitation to the court of Archelaus (whither Euripides, Agathon, Zeuxis and others went) is better authenticated: see Arist. Rhet. III. 23. 1398 ${ }^{\text {a }}{ }_{2}{ }_{4} \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta s$
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu a \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\partial} \mu \circ i ́ \omega s ~ \epsilon \hat{v} \pi a \theta \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \alpha, \dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \alpha i ้ \kappa a \kappa \omega ิ s$. Crito's connection with Thessaly is significant as to his political sympathies: in so far as he felt any interest in politics, he favoured the $\kappa a \lambda o i \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \theta 0 i$ or oligarchical party.

## CHAPTER v .

Crito concludes his appeal to Socrates by urging that it is wrong to choose the more indolent course and remain to die: he ought to think of his children and his friends.
 Apol. 35 в (the concluding part of Socrates' appeal as this is of
 $\kappa \tau \lambda$. It is not correct to translate סikatov here as 'just': it is 'right', 'moral'. This is the original meaning of the word, and far more frequent than the other, i.e. just )( $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu, \phi \rho o ́ \nu \iota \mu o s, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \rho \in \hat{i} 0 s-$ the other three cardinal virtues. Aristotle recognises both meanings of the word: see Eth. v. $1129^{\text {b }} 25$ where the pseudo-Theognic
 to illustrate the wider meaning. It was this sense that Socrates assigned to the word when he declared tò סiкatov to be identical with $\tau$ ò $\nu o ́ \mu \mu \mu 0 \nu$ : see Mem. IV. 4. I2 and cf. Introd. p. xiii. This wider meaning survives in the English 'justify'.
 neuter noun denoting some inanimate object. Wohlrab compares Isocrates I. 3 ка入̀̀̀ $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \epsilon ' \rho \gamma o \nu \epsilon ่ \pi \iota \chi \in \iota \rho o v ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$. $\sigma a \nu \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \pi \rho o \delta o \hat{\nu} a \iota$ is explanatory of $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$, to which it stands in apposition.
3. kai rolaûta $\sigma \pi \epsilon v$ v́ठıs. There is more force and indignation in $\sigma \pi \epsilon v ́ \delta \epsilon \epsilon s$ than $\sigma \pi \epsilon v \dot{\delta} \delta \iota \nu$ would have conveyed.

Crito means that Locrates' defence was meaningless unless he regarded it as important that he should live. He had spoken of himself as God's minister to the Athenians: was he to desert his post because they rejected him? See Apol. Chapter xviir.
5. $\sigma$ è $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \in i ̂ p a l-" ~ \sigma \epsilon ́ ~ i s ~ a c c e n t e d ~ f o r ~ e m p h a s i s, ~ a n d ~ t o ~ d i s c o n-~$ nect it from є̈ $\sigma \pi \epsilon v \sigma a \nu$ ". Dyer.
7. vieîs. Socrates had three sons: Lamprocles and two others. Lamprocles was the eldest (Mem. II. 2. 1) ; but he was still a youth when Socrates died (Apol. 34 D): the other two were children (Apol. 1. c. and Phaed. ıı6 в). We do not know whether they suffered in any way from their father's death. For the form vieis see my note on Apol. 20 A : the forms of the second declension (except viéos víci as well as viov vi(̂) are preferred in the singular: those of the third in the dual and plural. Attic inscriptions of Plato's time more often omit the $\iota$ than not (uós véoos etc. See Meisterhans, Gram-
matik der Attischen Inschriften, p. $\sigma_{2}$ ) : there are traces of the same omission in some mss of Plato, and Schanz now everywhere writes the word without the $\iota$ (see his preface to the Laws p. ViII).
$\pi \rho \circ \delta \iota \delta o ́ v a l=\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \in \iota \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho \circ \delta o i ̂ \nu a l$, whence the present. So $\delta \iota \delta o \delta_{\nu} \alpha \iota$ often means 'to offer'.
 already begun: whence the preposition: cf. infra $50 \mathrm{E} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi\rangle$
 and moral surveillance than intellectual: $\pi a \kappa \delta$ eia vice versa.
9. oix $\eta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in\llcorner$ ката入ıт $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ 'you will leave in the lurch'. The words imply that there would be something selfish and cowardly in the betrayal. $\tau$ ò $\sigma \grave{\partial} \nu \mu \notin \rho o s=$ pro tua parte, quod ad te attinet (Cron): so infra $\mathrm{s}^{\circ} \mathrm{B}$.
 to fare as chance directs', 'they will have to take their chance in
 $\pi \rho \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \xi 0 \nu \tau \in s$ Alc. II. 14I D.
II. év тaîs ópфaviaıs-ópфavov́s. Göbel points out that the repetition of the idea has a pathetic effect.
 owes a duty to one's family as well as to the State: Socrates placed his duty to the State before his duty to his family. $\pi o \iota \epsilon i \not \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi a i ̂ \delta a s$ i. q. $\pi a \iota \delta o \pi о \iota \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota$.
 that Crito contrasted the indifference of Socrates with the zeal displayed in his behalf by himself and the others: there is a touch of injured friendship about these words. See the reply of Socrates in
 there.
16. $\phi \dot{i} \sigma \kappa o v \tau \alpha \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \delta \dot{\eta}=$ quippe qui dicat. The touch of sarcasm in $\phi \dot{a} \sigma \kappa о \nu \tau \alpha$ is made sharper by the addition of $\delta \dot{\eta}$. For the assertion itself compare Apol. 30 A and 37 B. ठià tavtòs $\tau o \hat{u}$ ßiov has

 may be followed by is in the sense of 'for'.


 (already implied in $\dot{\rho} a \theta v \mu o ́ \tau a \tau \alpha$ of 14 and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \grave{\eta} \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta$ òs каї $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon i ̋ s$ of $\mathrm{I}_{5}$ ) is openly made: for by $\dot{\eta} \mu \in \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho($ as is clear from $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \hat{u}$ in
 his friends. It is implied that death requires less courage than life -a view which Socrates himself held. The reproach is made less biting by $\tau \iota \nu i$.
 тоиті-סокєiv. This explains in detail ämav $\tau \grave{o} \pi \rho \hat{\jmath} \gamma \mu a$. There is clearly an allusion to the stage. The tragedy begins-( $\epsilon \ddot{l} \sigma o \delta o s)$
 $\left.\pi \rho \alpha \xi_{\xi} \epsilon \omega s\right)$ : "solvuntur risu tabulae". The words are carefully chosen to suggest the comparison. eiซooios may be used both of the entrance of an actor (compare the use of $\epsilon i \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ in Apol. 35 B), and of the coming on of a law-suit (see on Apol. 24 D) : à $\gamma \omega \dot{\nu}$ signifies 'acting' as well as 'pleading': the word always implies rivalry as well as publicity.
21. єio $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\epsilon s}$. So I read with E and the second hand in B : the editors (except Stallbaum) generally read $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$. The latter
 passive to $\epsilon i \sigma a ́ \gamma \omega$ : compare Dem. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \Lambda \alpha ́ к \rho \iota \tau o \nu ~ 49 ~ \pi o ̂ ̂ ~ o u ̂ \nu ~ \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath ̂ ~ \tau a u ́ t \eta \nu ~}$ $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta i \kappa \eta \nu$, but (see following note) $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \epsilon$ goes better

 might have effected his escape in the interval between the lodging of the indictment with the King Archon and the actual trial. Had he done so, the case would have been decided against him by default, see on $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \nu$ кат $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma$ оро̂̂̀тєs Apol. i8 c. If we read $\dot{\omega}$ s $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ and not $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$, we must understand aủ $\hat{\eta}$ i.e. $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta i \kappa \eta$ after $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\imath} \nu \quad$ : this can hardly be right, for even if Socrates had absconded the trial would have come on: the only difference would have been the absence of the defendant. There is no good authority for the tradition that Anytus wished to make terms with Socrates after the indictment had been lodged; nor would such a course have been tolerated by Athenian law, since $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon \iota a$ was a $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$ or offence against the State, not a $\delta i \kappa \eta$ or lawsuit with a private individual.
 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota a$ as it were or catastrophe of the tragedy. The Bodleian has $\delta \dot{\eta} \pi o u$.
23. ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omega s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho a ́ \xi \in \omega s=$ 'a reductio ad absurdum as one might say of the whole affair'. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \xi \epsilon \omega s$ is an objective
 $\tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha a i \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho \alpha$ каi $\mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i \alpha a \pi \epsilon \rho i \delta \epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \eta$; See the retort of the



какía $\tau เ v i-\delta о к є i ̂ v=$ 'that you should be thought to have given us the slip, through a sort of cowardice and unmanliness on our part'. סокєî̀ $\delta \iota a \pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon v \gamma \epsilon ́ \nu a \iota$ is explanatory of $\tau o v \tau i$, exactly as $\sigma a v \tau o ̀ \nu$ $\pi \rho \circ \delta o \hat{\nu} \nu a \iota$ is of $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$ in 45 C line 2. The subject to $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ is $\sigma \epsilon$ : this is easily supplied from the context ( $\tau \grave{o} \pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \grave{\partial} \pi \epsilon \rho i \sigma \epsilon \in$ in 19 and $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$ in 2r). For the expression compare Phaed. 115C
 Hipp. Major $294 \mathrm{E} \beta a \beta a i$, oí $\chi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho a \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s \delta \iota a \pi \epsilon \phi \in v \gamma o ́ s, \hat{\omega}^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \pi \pi i a$. Göbel takes $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ as subject to $\delta о к \epsilon i ̂ \nu: ~ W o h l r a b ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau a i ̂ o \nu ~$ ס̀े routi: the other editors fail to give any clear explanation of this difficult passage. There is some awkwardness in having $\delta о к \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \delta \iota a-$ $\pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon \cup \gamma \in \in v a \iota$ as virtually a subject to $\delta \delta \xi \eta$ in line 18 above: but the grammatical subject is $\tau 0 v \tau i$, to which $\delta o \kappa \in i v \nu$ is in apposition. Mudge conjectures $\delta о \kappa \hat{\eta}$, but the text is quite sound.
25. oủSè $\sigma$ v̀ $\sigma$ avtóv. The relative clause passes into a main 46 A


 aúrov, and see my note on Apol. 40 A ä $\gamma \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$ оiŋ $\theta \epsilon i \eta-\kappa а i ̀ \nu о \mu i \zeta \epsilon \tau a \iota$.
oióv $\tau \epsilon$ öv кai $\delta v v a \tau o ́ v$. The twofold expression is for emphasis: cf. infra line 3 I dáoúvatov каì oủкє́ $\tau \iota$ oĩóv $\tau \epsilon$. оîò $\tau \epsilon$ is 'feasible': סuvatóv 'possible'.
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\varphi}$ is substantival. So in the Gorgias ( 474 E foll.) tò ai $\sigma \chi \rho o{ }^{\nu} \nu$ is defined as that which is at once $\lambda \nu \pi \eta \rho o ́ \nu ~ \tau є ~ к а i ~ к а к o ́ \nu: ~ s e e ~ a l s o ~ 475 ~ в ~$


28. $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \epsilon ́=$ vel potius, as in Gorg. 449 A $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon}, \hat{\omega}$


 $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \mu \in \theta$." Jacobs. Note the fourfold recurrence of $\beta$. $\quad$. $\lambda \in \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (ßov入خ́).
 lieve the vision (see on 44 B above): the $\gamma v \nu \grave{\eta} \kappa a \lambda \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha a l \in u \in \iota \delta{ }^{\prime} s$ left Socrates one night more in which to effect his escape. With $\tau \hat{\eta} s$



## CHAPTER VI.

Crito's pleading is now concluded. In reply, Socrates begins by laying down the principles which should guide his decision. He first recalls one great doctrine on which he had insisted throughout all his life, viz. that no opinions are worth regarding except the opinions of those who know. See Introduction pp. xi and xii.
 conditional sentence" Goodwin MT. ii8. It would not be possible to understand $\ddot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon i \eta$ : if the optative of the copula is omitted in an apodosis with $\stackrel{a}{\alpha} \nu$, the $\not \partial \nu$ must be inserted: see Meno 96 в ои̉кои̂ $\subset i$
 $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau o s, \delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$, öт८ ov̉к $\partial \nu \partial \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \iota \gamma \epsilon$; But even apart from this, in cases like the present Greek prefers the more dogmatic form of expression. Note $\epsilon i-\epsilon i \eta$ and not $\epsilon i-\hat{\eta} \nu$ : Socrates speaks as one who
 $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha \phi^{\prime} \rho \eta$ (Rep. III. 394 D).
4. $\sigma \kappa 0 \pi \in \hat{i} \theta$ at is placed in the emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence as if $=\sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \circ \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$.
5. oủ $\mu$ óvov vข̂v. So the MSS: there is no reason to read oủ $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu$ with Nauck and Schanz. The omission of the copula is not very common in Plato except when it is $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ : yet cf. Prot. 335 C $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$
 $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu . \quad \hat{\epsilon} \hat{l}$ and $\hat{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \dot{\nu}$ are also sometimes omitted: ${ }^{\hat{\eta}} \nu$ rarely, except in the phrase $\epsilon i \mu \eta ̀ \delta \iota a ́ \tau \iota \nu a$ ( $\sigma \hat{\epsilon}$ or the like): parts of the conjunctive and optative are very seldom omitted: eival however is left out very frequently. See Schanz, Novae Comm. Pl. $3 \mathrm{I}-35^{\circ}$
 Crito's $\pi \epsilon^{i} \theta_{0 \nu} \mu 0 \iota(46 \mathrm{~A})$, for $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ includes Socrates' friends as well as everything else that could be called his.
 rule of life. For example, before entering on a line of conduct he would inquire if it harmonised with the conception or definition ( 入óros) of $\tau$ ò Sikaloy which he had arrived at by the exercise of his reason : and if it did, nothing ever deterred him from so acting : see my Introduction to the Apology p. xi; compare also Phaed. 100 A , where Plato uses the phraseology of the Socratic method to de-





 тolô̂rov, $\mu \grave{\eta} \phi \hat{\omega}$ : and compare as to this point Dr Jackson on the "incomplete Protagoreans" of the Theaetetus in Journal of Philology, Vol. XIII. 249-250.
9. entyov: imperfect, because Socrates is referring to the teaching of his whole life. Infra $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}=$ 'throw over', 'discard',


 $\sigma \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ є่к $\alpha \sigma \tau о \tau \epsilon \gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$.
10. ő $\mu$ oto (sc. $\lambda$ órou) is probably the subject and not the predicate, otherwise in place of $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \beta \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ we should expect a word $=$ 'to change': the predicate is $\phi$ aivov $\alpha a \iota$ (sc. $\beta \in \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \iota$ ). ${ }^{\circ} \mu 0 \iota o \iota$ is not $=$ oi aúroi (idem) but $=\mathrm{L}$ atin similes: the two ideas are carefully distinguished in Theaet. 159 A $\epsilon i$ ă $\rho a \tau \iota \sigma \nu \mu \beta a l \nu \in \iota ~ o ̋ ~ \mu o \iota o ́ \nu \tau \varphi$


 $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.
11. $\pi p \in \sigma \beta \varepsilon v \in \omega$ is a lofty and somewhat poetic word, frequently 46 C used of regard paid to the gods.



 $53 \mathrm{~A} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ aủ $\hat{\eta} s \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \sigma a s$. The Mop $\omega \dot{\omega}$ was well known in the Greek nursery (see Theocr. xv. 40 oủk $\mathfrak{a} \xi \hat{\omega} \tau v, \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu \nu \nu$. M op $\mu \dot{\omega}$
 Moр $\mu$ о и́к $\eta$, " $\mathrm{E} \mu \pi$ ои $\sigma a$ : see Becker's Charicles E.T. pp. ${ }^{224}$ 225. Compare the well-known passage in the Phaedo ( 77 E ) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ '

 $\lambda 仑 ́ к \in \iota a$.

It should be noted that the order of the words $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi a \hat{\alpha} \delta a s$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ is very idiomatic: the effect is almost to identify the objects compared. If $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ preceded $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi a i \delta a s$ the connection between the two would be much less close. Still more idiomatic is the

> A. C.
construction in similes with $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ and a preposition．If it is wished to bring the objects compared into the closest possible union；$\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$（ $\dot{\omega}$ ）with the preposition is placed first，and the pre－ position itself written only once ：see for example Rep．vill． 545 E

 scripts however often violate the rule so far as the omission of the preposition is concerned：see Cobet，Variae Lectiones p． 165 foll．

15．$\delta \in \sigma \mu$ ov̀s кail $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v s ~ к \tau \lambda . ~ \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 l=$ chains $)(\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha ́=$ im－ prisonment：see on Apol． 32 C ．The plural（ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu o i$, ， ávazot，$\chi \rho \eta \mu a \dot{-}$ $\tau \omega \nu \dot{d} \phi a \iota \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon s)$ adds to the rhetorical effect：the many have a variety of deaths etc．，from which to choose our $\mu \circ \rho \mu \dot{\omega}$ ．
 $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s \epsilon \in \iota \pi \epsilon \in \mu \psi \eta$ ．The word means＇inflicting on＇（Church），not of course＇threatening with＇．Socrates means that death is only a $\mu \circ \rho \mu \dot{\omega}$ ， not simply in the anticipation but in the actual suffering of it．Dr Verrall suggests $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \pi o v \sigma a$ as if $=$＇assuming the forms of＇like the Empusa．I am not quite satisfied that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha$ is rightly formed，nor even allowing this does the construction seem quite natural ：but I am convinced that Plato wrote＇̇ $\pi \iota \pi \epsilon \in \mu \pi o v \sigma a$ rather than $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho 0 v_{\sigma} a$ let us say，because the ending is identical with ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \pi \pi \sigma \sigma a$ ：see my note on 47 в line 14 for more examples of the play upon words in Plato．
 $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \chi \theta \alpha \iota$ ．
 $\dot{\delta} \rho \theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s} \epsilon \dot{i} \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ），where the first inquiry is concluded：the second point is then raised by way of protest against the first（ibid．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$,
 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ has no єîтa or $\epsilon i \tau \tau \alpha \delta \hat{\epsilon}$ to balance it．

18．тоїтov тòv $\lambda$ óyov ảva入áßot $\mu \in \nu=$＇recur to this view＇：ovitos is often＝＇that of yours＇，here made clearer by $o \partial \nu \sigma \dot{v} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon s$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda a \mu$－ $\beta \alpha{ }^{\prime} \omega$ is＇iterum sumo＇－＇take up where I laid down＇as in Rep．vi． $490 \mathrm{D} \pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \phi \iota \lambda \sigma \sigma \delta \phi \omega \nu$ фv́ $\sigma \iota \nu$ ．The reference is to $44 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{D}$ ，and 45 E ．
 cf．Apol．19 A $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ oû $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ тís $\dot{\eta}$ кат $\eta \gamma \quad \rho i a \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ ；In English we must say＇recur－and ask if＇．The subject to $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \epsilon \\ \epsilon \\ \gamma\end{gathered}$ тo is $\dot{o}$ 入óros，to be understood from roûto $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ 入órov：it is defined by the clause ö̃ $\iota$ taîs $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu-o u ̈$ ．The imperfect is used because Socrates
refers to the teaching of his whole life, see on ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \circ \nu$ in line 9 above. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau о \tau \epsilon$ means on every occasion when the subject was discussed. If there was one thing on which Socrates insisted more than any other, it was that no man's opinion is worth anything on any subject which he has not studied: see Grote Vol. vili. p. 239 foll.
 doctrine that only some $\delta o \xi \xi \iota$ are worthy of regard was right, or (b) it was wrong, or (c) it was right then and wrong now. In his statement of the third alternative Socrates substitutes the application for the statement of the general principle-was $I$ right in thinking it my duty to die then, although others thought otherwise, and am I wrong now?
 $\beta \eta$ кòs тои̂то áraӨò̀ $\gamma \in \gamma o \nu$ éval: and Socrates must often have said the same in declining Crito's former invitations to escape: see on 44 B

 ठiкacos Greek prefers the personal mode of expression. ä $\rho a=$ 'after all' expresses surprise and disappointment. See on Apol. 34 c є́ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$

 ä $\lambda \lambda \omega s$ : the expression ( $\dot{0}$ 入óros) ả $\lambda \lambda \omega s$ évcка $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v$ is excessively awkward. For $a^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ s used in this way ( $=$ 'otherwise than it ought'
 $\epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 s \epsilon i \eta$, and the adverbial expression $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega s$, as in Theaet.

23. $\omega$ s $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$. Like $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ öv $\nu \iota$ and $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \in i a$ this expression is frequent in the dialogues of Plato's early and middle period: in the later dialogues $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$, oै $\nu \tau \omega s$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i ́ a$ (less frequent) are more common: see Schanz in Hermes (1886) xxi. 3, pp. 439-459. As for the origin of the phrase, Schanz accepts the explanation given by Fox, according to whom $\dot{\omega} s$ is the ablative of the article, as $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ is of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} s$ : but surely $\tau \dot{\omega} s$ and not $\dot{\omega} s$ is the ablative of $\tau o ́$. The old explanation (which I prefer) is to regard the phrase as parallel to $\dot{\omega}$ s
 $\sigma o \phi o i \dot{\omega} s \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ (Phaed. 63 A ) for example is short for $\sigma o \phi o i$ ovit $\omega$, $\omega$ s à $\lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \in s$ є́ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$. Kühner's Ausführliche Grammatik II. p. 92 I.
 etc. were almost technical terms of the Socratic dialectic: see Introd. to Apol. p. xv.

27．т $\hat{\nu} \nu$ oio $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \nu \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．Socrates means himself primarily ： but he chooses a phrase which will include Crito too，so as to make his conclusion appear as the verdict of all right－minded men．$\lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \epsilon \iota$ $\tau_{\iota}$ ）（ovi $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu$ ，＇to be right＇）（＇to be wrong＇：so in English＇there is something in what you say＇．So $\tau i \pi \pi \kappa \epsilon i \nu=$＇to be making some－ thing of it＇in Symp． 173 A ．$\hat{\varphi} \delta \epsilon$ before $\dot{\iota} \pi \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{o}} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oio $\mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ refers forward to ö $\tau \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta o \xi \omega \nu-\tau \dot{\alpha} s \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta^{\prime}$ ．

28．$\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \eta^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \circ v$ goes with the following clause ：in
 $\delta \dot{\eta}=\alpha \rho \tau i \omega s$ as so often（see my note on Apol． 37 c ）：Cobet would write $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ ，and Schanz now follows him：B too has $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ here． There is no special force in the imperfect：$\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \quad \nu$ and $\epsilon \phi \eta \nu$（like
 aorists．See also Goodwin MT． 8.
 lines 19－20．The principle is enunciated more precisely because upon it hinges the argument down to 48 A ．
46 E 30．$\pi$ jpòs $\theta \in \omega \hat{v}$ ：only in entreaties，not in asseverations：Apol． 25 C．


 Socrates believed that he would die upon the third day，but as Crito disbelieved the vision（see on 46 A）Socrates waives the point for the present．$\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{a} \pi<0 \theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu=\dot{\alpha} \pi о \theta a \nu \in \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．
47 A 33．таракрои́ol．Like $\sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ this word is probably a metaphor from the palaestra：cf．Theaet． 168 A $\tau \dot{a} \sigma \phi \dot{a} \lambda \mu a \tau a$ ä aủ The original meaning may have been to give an unfair blow， hit below the belt．There is a touch of irony in oúk à $\nu \sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ тapa－ крои́л：Socrates knew well that it was Crito and not he whose mental vision was dimmed by the coming doom（see Phaed． $8_{4}$ E）．I think the words are meant as a reply to Crito＇s taunt in
 emphatic：see note．For this reason I have printed $\sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ with an accent．

34．ov̉X iкavติs：infra oủxi кa入̂̂s in line $3^{6}$ is stronger：cf． in 46 в the change from ö $\mu$ ooo to $\tau$ oùs aúroús：see note in loc． Hirschig＇s oủxi кал⿳亠丷厂s（the one tolerable suggestion of the thirty odd
suggestions which he has made on the Crito) completely misses the point.
 mss (and the second hand in B) read oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon} ~ \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ ov'; Apart from their slender ms authority, the words are objectionable ( $\alpha$ ) because they correspond to nothing either in 46 c
 ( $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \delta \xi \hat{\omega} \nu$ âs oi ä $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ oc $\delta 0 \xi \alpha \dot{\zeta} \sigma v \sigma \iota \nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.), and ( $\beta$ ) because they
 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \rho \delta \nu \omega \nu$; Plato is especially careful to avoid any premature indications of the course of an argument: he professes to follow ö $\pi \eta$


## CHAPTER VII.

In this chapter Socrates recalls the familiar illustrations by which he used to enforce the doctrine that no opinion deserves to be considered except that of those who know, and applies them to the case in point. Introduction p. xii.

 $\pi \epsilon \in \rho \epsilon$ єitc $\mu \dot{\alpha} s$. It is a mistaken idea that $\tau o \iota \sigma \sigma \delta \epsilon$ is invariably prospective, and $\tau 0 \circ 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o s$ retrospective. The imperfect $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau \circ$ is used because Socrates is recalling the doctrines taught throughout his



 $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \kappa \tau \lambda$.

кal тоиิто $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu=$ 'and making this his work': hoc agens. Buttmann compares Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 22 oủdè $\gamma$ à $\notin \kappa \kappa \rho a ́ \tau o u v ~ a u ̀ t o u ̂ ~$
 Compare $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \gamma \mu \alpha=$ 'profession' in Apol. 20 C.
 is there regarded as the $\delta \eta \mu \iota o v \rho \gamma$ os $\dot{v} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \epsilon i a s:$ the $\pi a \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s$ as the


 ( 464 B foll.) iaт $\rho \iota \kappa \eta$ and $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ are described as the two
branches of the art which looks after the body ( $\dot{\eta} \tau o \hat{u} \sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$ $\partial \epsilon \rho a \pi \epsilon(\dot{a})$; they are correlative ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \circ \iota$ ) with $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota o \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \eta$ ( $\delta \iota-$ $\kappa а \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta})$ and $\nu 0 \mu \nu \theta \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$, the two subdivisions of $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ or the art which pays attention to the soul. Plato frequently places the two professions side by side: e.g. Prot. $3^{13}$ D $̇$ éà $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \leqslant \tau \tau u ́ \chi \eta \gamma v \mu$ -
 professions were united in the person of Herodicus of Selymbria:



9. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta}: \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ is regular in such antitheses: see on Apol. 23 D.
12. тav́тท—ท̂̃ a̋v $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Note the position of $\tau a v i \tau \eta:$ it serves to throw special emphasis on the clause introduced by $\hat{j} \alpha{ }^{\circ} \nu$.
 $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} 0 \nu$. In $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \notin \circ \nu \gamma \epsilon$ the $\gamma \epsilon$ is added because what follows incul-
 xai- $\gamma \epsilon$ is frequently used in this way to introduce something which belongs to a different class from the things already enume-

 hang together, being all concerned with number or mathematics. On the food of a Greek athlete cf. Aristotle Eth. Nic. II. 1 ro6 ${ }^{\text {a }} 36$ ff.


 $\mu \epsilon \in \nu \varphi \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \nu \mu \nu a \epsilon i \omega \nu \pi o \lambda u ́$.
 tional point if it is noted that the word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ suggests $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau a-$ $\mu a \iota$ and so leads up to $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi\end{gathered} \hat{0} \nu \tau \iota$ : Socrates wishes to deduce from the example of training the general principle that only he who knows deserves to be regarded. The word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta$ s is sometimes used in
 $\pi \epsilon i \theta o \nu \tau a \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{d} \tau a \iota s$ ( $=$ paedotribis, as Schneider correctly explains it), and see also Rep. VII. $5^{21}$ E $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ a u ̈ \xi \eta s ~ к a i ̀ ~ \phi \theta i-~$ $\sigma \epsilon \omega \bar{\epsilon} \pi \in \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon \bar{i}$ (sc. $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ ). Plato repeatedly thinks of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ $\sigma \tau a \mu a \iota$ when he uses the words $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta$ s or $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \hat{\omega}$ : see for





 $\sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu:$ Rep. IV. 443 E бофíaע $\delta \grave{\iota} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \tau 0 \hat{v} \sigma a \nu \tau a u ́ \tau \eta \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\pi \rho \dot{\beta} \xi \epsilon \iota \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$. I have no doubt that Socrates thought it a real confirmation of his view that knowledge should everywhere hold rule when he found that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\prime} \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ seem to be connected, and I think Plato hints at this in such passages as Polit. 3 II C $\dot{\delta} \pi \dot{\sigma} \alpha \nu \nu$-a' $\rho \chi \eta \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \hat{\eta}$. 'God and Nature do nothing in vain': even the similarity of names is not without its significance: hence Plato wrote the Cratylus. A precisely similar phenomenon appears in the case of the word $\epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$. Just as here $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \eta$ forms the transition to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a i \neq \nu \tau \iota$, so in Charm. 173 D

 $\epsilon \dot{u} \delta \alpha \iota \mu \circ \nu \circ \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu)$ : see also 172 A and Alcibiades 1. 116 в and compare

 has two meanings) forms the link between $\alpha \alpha^{\gamma} \alpha 0 \dot{\nu} \nu$ and $\xi v \nu \delta \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ —каl
 should be noted that the omission of the article before $\delta \epsilon \in \circ \nu$ (as here before $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \dot{o} o \nu \tau \iota$ ) favours my view. Similarly in Symp. 204 C, where Plato proves that $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$ is $\kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\nu} \nu$ by means of the middle term
 $\tau \hat{\psi} \delta \nu \tau \iota \kappa a \lambda \grave{\nu} \kappa \tau \lambda$. : the entire passage from 203 A to 204 D is full of such double meanings and constructions. See also Symp. 196 c. This sort of chain-inference (incorrectly called Sorites) was afterwards very popular in the Stoic school : see Reid on Cic. Acad. Pr. 49.

I have insisted on this point partly because the editors have ignored it and partly on account of the light it throws on the meaning of the vision in 44 B: Socrates was greatly influenced by similarity of name.

It should be noted that $\epsilon \pi a i t \epsilon \nu$ is a favourite word of Plato's ${ }_{x}$ but less common in other authors. Protagoras used the word frequently : according to Kock on Arist. Nubes 650 it was probably an importation from the Ionian philosophical schools into the sophistic and philosophical circles of Athens.
17. є $\epsilon \in \nu$ was pronounced $\epsilon \overparen{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ with intervocalic aspiration as in $\tau \alpha \omega \mathrm{s}$ : the derivation is doubtful, but it can hardly come from $\epsilon i \mu i$ :
see on Apol. 18 e. Possibly it is connected with $\epsilon \tau a$ : for as Timaeus s. v. says, it is not only $\sigma v \gamma \kappa a \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota s \tau \omega ̂ \nu \epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$, but also $\sigma v \nu a \phi \grave{\eta}$ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau \alpha$ : whence Suidas explains it as $=\ddot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$. Here for example it leads up to $\alpha \pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$. : cf. Symp. 204 C є $\hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$,
 $\chi \rho \epsilon i a \nu$ é $\chi \in \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ a ̉ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o เ s ;$
 all the best mss. The difficulties felt with regard to the text arise from a misapprehension of the argument. Socrates is gradually passing from the illustration to the case which it was intended to illustrate. Hence at first when he is only elucidating the illustration he introduces more detail: supra 47 В $\phi \circ \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \chi \rho \eta ̀$ тò̀s $\psi$ brous $\kappa \alpha i \grave{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\zeta} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ тoùs $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a i \nu o u s:$ as the application draws near
 $\nu o u s)$ : when we are on the verge of the application, there is only $\tau \iota \mu \eta \sigma a s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ órous, because it is a $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ which all this was meant to illustrate, viz. that Crito and his friends and Socrates himself are cowards in leaving Socrates to die. Schanz brackets and Kral omits кai zoùs émaivous: the other editors rightly retain the words. Ziwsa in the Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1879 p. 106


 like 46 в $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu i{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$.
25. oủkov̂v кaì $\tau a ̉ \lambda \lambda \alpha$-oṽт $\omega$ : "verbo omisso, ut Lach. 181 A

26. kai $\delta \dot{\eta}$ kai is used to introduce a climax, or (as here) the crowning point of the reasoning-the application: see on Apol. 26 D.
27. Sıкаí $\omega \nu$ каl $\alpha \delta i ́ \kappa \omega \nu$ : Cron draws attention to the chiastic arrangement:

| $\left.\underset{\alpha \iota \delta i \kappa \omega \nu}{\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega \nu} \not \begin{array}{c} a i \sigma \chi \rho \omega \nu \\ \kappa a \lambda \omega \nu \end{array}\right\rangle$ |
| :---: |
|  |  |



 $\mu \in \theta a$. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}$ with fut. ind. is more vivid and impassioned than $\tilde{\eta}^{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\eta}$ with aor. conj. $\lambda \omega \beta \bar{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is to add insult to injury. é $\kappa \in i \hat{\nu} \nu$ is



 (and truth is seen by $\nu$ ous, cf. Rep. Vi. 508 C-DD and Symp. $212 \mathrm{~A})$. Observe that the doctrine of the duality of soul and body is implied throughout the whole of this passage: it is one of the most distinctive traits of Plato's teaching, as it was of his master's: see Phaed. $79 \mathrm{C}, 82 \mathrm{E}$ (the soul investigates things by looking out of the prison-house of the body). To Plato the body is but the öpravov



 Rep. v. 469 E , where those who wreak their vengeance on the dead bodies of their enemies are likened to hounds aî roîs $\lambda i \theta o u s$ ois ä $\nu$

 right, and disabled by wrong' (Church): see last note. For this
 $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \kappa \tau \lambda$. Goodwin MT. 8. The use of $\hat{\eta} \nu=$ 'is ex hypothesi' does not differ greatly from this.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Here Socrates finally disposes of the first point raised by Crito, viz. that we should regard the opinions of the many, and proceeds to discuss the second (see above, 44 D )-that the many can take away our lives.

 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{v} \gamma \iota \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha l \nu \nu \sigma \omega ́ \delta \eta$.
 of $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ : Plato has arranged his words so as to express the double
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$. , for the text at once suggests $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \mu \grave{\eta}$ ध̇ $\pi \alpha \ddot{\partial} \nu \tau \tau \nu$. Compare Legg. II. 67 I D $\nu \eta \dot{\eta} \phi o \nu \tau a s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu \mu \eta ̀ ~ \nu \eta \phi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o u ́ s, ~$
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta \circ \rho \rho \dot{\beta} \beta \omega \nu$ sc. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi b \nu \tau \omega \nu \nu \eta \phi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$. Hirschig foolishly corrupts the text to $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta$ ó $\mu \epsilon \nu \circ \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{~}$ ध่ $\pi a \ddot{\partial} \nu \nu \tau \omega \nu \delta o ́ \xi \eta$.
6. тоиิто тò $\sigma \hat{\mu} \mu a$. тoûto is of course in the predicate: Wohl- 47 E rab is wrong in reading rov̂रo $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ with Buttmann; for $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ without
the article is 'body' generally, i.e. 'matter', not 'the body': cf.


8. $\mu \in \tau \dot{d} \mu \circ \chi \theta \eta \rho \circ \hat{v}$. The preposition $\mu \in \tau \dot{d}$ is far more frequent than $\sigma v \dot{v}$ in Plato, as in Attic Greek generally (except Xenophon): $\sigma u ́ v$ denotes a much closer connection. • $\mu 0 \chi \theta \eta \rho o ́ s ~ l i k e ~ \pi o \nu \eta \rho o ́ s ~ m e a n t ~$ originally 'afflicted' (as here), then 'depraved', 'corrupt', for toíos
 $\dot{\alpha}^{2} \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon$ (Hom. Od. xviil. r36-137). So also Ar. Av.

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha ̀ \pi 0 \nu \eta \rho o i ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$, and Hesiod Frag. 95. I (ed. Göttling) $\pi 0 \nu \eta$ ро́тator кai äpıotoy (of Heracles). It is we and not the Greeks who by suffering are made strong. Cf. Simonides Frag. 5. 10-13 ed. Bergk.
10. ov̉ $\delta a \mu$ ûs. Plato held that it is better to die than to suffer incurable disease: Gorg. 512 A -a passage which is parallel to this both in respect of the illustration and the application- $\epsilon i \mu \hat{e} \nu$ тis

 the "meditative skipper". The whole subject is discussed in Rep. III. 405 foll. The presence of too many doctors, says Plato, proves that a city is physically unsound just as a plethora of $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau a l$ proves that it is unsound morally: ibid. 410 A it is prescribed that doctors



 merciful way of treating the patients themselves and the best thing for the State. Herodicus is censured as $\mu a \kappa \rho \grave{\nu} \nu-\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \operatorname{\theta a\nu a\tau o\nu } a \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ тoınбas ( 406 в), because he prolonged his life by a course of medical treatment: the right view is that ovi $\delta \nu \grave{\imath} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \grave{\eta} \delta \iota \alpha$ 及iov

 leian : the editors mostly follow less good mSS and read $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ '- $\dot{\alpha} \rho a$. The $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a ́$ introduces a fresh point in the argument: cf. Apol. 37 C $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ र $\rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, кai $\delta \epsilon \delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ 光 $\omega s$ ä̀ $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau i \sigma \omega$; For the collocation $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' $\hat{a} \rho \alpha$ ( $\mathfrak{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ in this connection generally invites the answer ' $n o$ ')


 $\tilde{a}_{\rho} \rho$ is separated from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\dot{\alpha}}$ in order to let the full stress of the sentence-accent fall on $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon i v o v$, which introduces the application.
 cusative after $\lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ : the dative is here preferred in order to avoid the appearance of ambiguity. Ar. Eq. $1408 \ell^{\prime} \nu$ ' $\tau \delta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ aútò̀ ois $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \theta^{\prime}$ oi $\xi \in \nu o l$. The verb of kindred meaning $\lambda \nu \mu a i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a l-$ not found in Plato-may also be construed with a dative as well as with an accusative.




 of asserting the dignity of the soul.




19. ov̉k ảpa-mávv $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu i \hat{\nu}$ oṽт $\omega$ : oű $\tau \omega$ goes with $\pi \alpha ́ \nu v$. I think this more probable than to take ov $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu v$ together: $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu v$ seems too emphatic to admit of this interpretation.
20. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} o \tau_{\iota} \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi a i t \omega v$. The Bodleian has ö $\tau \iota$, which may be right, as the Greeks probably considered ö $\tau \iota$ and ö $\tau \iota$ to be the same word (=quod) : see my Apology p. 123.
22. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \hat{\epsilon} v$ instead of being followed by $\epsilon i \tau \alpha$ or $\epsilon \pi \pi \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha$ ( $\delta \hat{\epsilon})$ corresponds to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ in line 25 below : the second argument of Crito is quoted as an objection to Socrates' refutation of the first: see on $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ in 46 c .
 means to introduce a subject or a proposal in a formal way: see
 $\sigma \theta \eta$, and Pl. Symp. 176 E тò $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тoûto єí $\eta \gamma \circ \hat{v} \mu a \iota \tau \eta \grave{\nu} \mu \grave{e} \nu$ ä $\rho \tau \iota$ $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta 0 \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \nu$ av̉ $\eta \tau \rho i \delta \alpha$ रaipєı $\bar{\epsilon} \alpha \hat{\alpha} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. Perhaps Plato chooses the word in order to suggest that Crito as it were $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \delta i \kappa \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\nu \dot{c} \mu \omega \nu$-the Laws being on their defence: see Introd. pp. vii-xi.
${ }^{25}$. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \mu \dot{\lambda} \nu \delta \eta$ : here begins Socrates' reply to the second point raised by Crito: see above 44 D. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}=$ 'for that matter',


 III． 409 в．

27．$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ ．$\delta \eta$ каi тav̂тa кт入．＝＇of course，that is also evident： yes，Socrates，he will say so＇．If the text is right，I think $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \quad \delta \dot{\eta}$ каi $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ is an aside：the answer to Socrates＇remark is contained in $\phi a i \eta \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \stackrel{a}{a} \nu$ ．Crito（who is not yet convinced by Socrates＇rea－ soning）first declares that the power of the many to put one to death（ $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a)$ is as obvious as the necessity of regarding what they think of one（ $\kappa \alpha i$ ）：he then assents to Socrates＇remark．See above
 $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．

With Cron and Kral I have retained the vulgate，because I think it presents the fewest difficulties．Wohlrab gives $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha \alpha \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha i$
 $\lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon s$ to Socrates：Schanz brackets dain $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{a} \nu$ ，and gives both $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha a i \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon s$ to Crito：Göbel prints＂$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$
 think the text is probably right as it stands：but if not，I should
 taking $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$ as an adverb as it is in the MSS（ $\delta \eta \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$ ）．

oû̃ós $\tau \epsilon: \tau \epsilon$ corresponds to каí in каì тóvסє aṽ бкóтєє line 3 r． There is virtually an anacoluthon，since oùtós $\tau \epsilon$ ó 入óros－$\delta о к є \hat{\imath}$
 oú $\tau \grave{\grave{\prime}}$ 广 $\hat{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．：but whether the second principle is still binding or not，has not yet been decided：whence каi $\tau$ óv $\delta \epsilon ~ a \hat{v} ~ \sigma \kappa o ́ \pi \epsilon є ~ к \tau \lambda . ~$
 but as $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ for $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \in \rho \varphi$ or $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \varphi$ is，to say the least of it，unusual，and the кai is awkward，I follow Wex， Madvig and recent editors（except Göbel）in reading каi $\pi \rho о ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$. öцооо каì $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu=$ similis quam antea：see above 46 в $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta o ́ \nu$
 тро́тєроу．
 held this view during the trial：see Apol． 28 в and ch．xxiif．Com－




necessary because $\epsilon \hat{\cup} \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ has a double meaning (see above on 47 в $\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\partial} \eta \eta$ кaì $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \dot{\partial} \circ \nu \tau \iota)$ : it is necessary also to identify $\epsilon \hat{v}$ with $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega s$ because the next chapter opens with the question $\pi \delta \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$

 regular in Plato, not $\tau$ aủró and the like : see on Apol. 24 C. Schanz now thinks it probable that Plato always used the forms in $-\nu$ : see his Preface to the Laws p. vi.

## CHAPTER IX.

This and the following chapter make a kind of interlude. Socrates has now reached his principle or $\lambda$ ó $\gamma o s$, viz. ö $\tau \iota$ oú $\tau$ ò $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \pi \epsilon p i$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau o v \pi o \imath \eta \tau \epsilon \in \circ \nu$, á $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ тò $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega \omega s \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$. Before introducing the Laws to prove that if Socrates made his escape he would violate this principle, Socrates pauses to emphasize the full force and meaning of this 入óros, and the irrelevancy of every other. Throughout this and the following chapters it must be borne in mind that Socrates identified $\tau o ̀ ~ \delta i ́ к a \iota o \nu$ with $\tau \grave{o} \nu o ́ \mu \mu \mu \nu \nu$ : see Introd. p. xiii.
 like (Graser quoted by Wohlrab). See above on öт $\epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \omega$ in 45 в. тoûto refers forward to $\pi$ о́тєрор $\delta i \kappa \alpha \iota o \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.
2. тóтєpov Síkalov кт入. ठíкalov is 'right': see on 45 C above. Crito had put the question on the same grounds in the passage re-

 $\dot{\alpha} \phi i \epsilon \mu \epsilon \in \nu \sigma \epsilon$.
4. $\eta$ ข ov̉ Síkatov: more emphatic and clear than $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ oủ: so in B 48 C above $\mu \in ́ v \epsilon \iota ~ \eta ̀ ~ o u ̉ ~ \mu e ́ v \epsilon \iota . ~$
 clause is placed first so as to let emphasis be thrown on $\sigma \dot{v})(\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ : ai $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \psi \epsilon \iota s$ äs $\sigma \dot{v} \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota s$ would be much less pointed. Cron remarks that when the antecedent is adopted into the relative clause, the article is more usually omitted, as in oüs $\dot{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ \nu o \mu i \zeta \epsilon \iota ~ \theta \epsilon o u ̀ s ~ o v ̉$ $\nu \circ \mu i \zeta \omega \nu$. Tr. 'as for the considerations you mention, about' etc.
8. $\omega$ s $\alpha^{\lambda} \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ : see on 46 D above.
9. $\sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ ई̂. $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ is of course in the predicate. The antecedent to $\tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ is not $\sigma \kappa \hat{\epsilon} \psi \epsilon \iota \stackrel{\text { but }}{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s} \chi \rho \eta \mu a \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$ каì $\delta o ́ \xi \eta s$

кaì $\pi a l \delta \omega \nu \tau \rho o \phi \hat{\eta} s$. On $\mu \dot{\eta} \grave{\eta}$ ( $=$ nescio an sit) see Goodwin MT. 83: probably some word expressing fear or apprehension ought to be understood: see on Apol. 39 A $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ov̉ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \chi^{a \lambda \epsilon \pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\nu}$.
 44 D) ảvó ${ }^{\prime} \tau$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \dot{o} \nu \tau \iota \nu 0 \hat{v} \nu \dot{a} \nu$ ö $\tau \iota \tau \dot{v} \chi 0 \iota \tau \tau \hat{v} \tau 0 \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu$. We are of course not justified in seeing here an allusion to the alleged remorse of the Athenians after Socrates' death: the tradition about their repentance is late and untrustworthy: see Grote, Vol. viII. p. 302. For ${ }_{a} \nu$ with the participle in apodosis cf. Legg. vi. 781 A $\pi 0 \lambda \dot{v}$ á $\mu \in \iota \nu 0 \nu$ ä $\nu$
 $\sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ more often means 'to come to life again' : for the causative
 $\sigma \theta a \iota$.
 $\tau \iota \mathcal{\epsilon} \xi \circ \delta o s \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \grave{j} \xi \dot{v} \nu \nu \hat{\varphi}$. Plato occasionally uses $\xi \dot{\psi} \nu$ in such adverbial phrases, e.g. $\xi \dot{v} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$ oopú $\beta \omega$ Rep. VI. 492 B : otherwise it generally occurs in religious uses like Legg. inf. 682 A $\xi$ v́v $\tau \iota \sigma \iota \mathrm{X} \alpha \dot{\rho} \iota \sigma \iota$ каi Moúraıs, or where the connection is a very close one, as in Legg.



$\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ : ô̂̀os like the Latin iste expresses contempt. Note in the next sentence the emphatic place assigned to $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu)(\tau o i ̂$ $\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \lambda \mathrm{ois}$.

 the object is expressed as in Rep. x. 607 в $\dot{\delta} \gamma$ à $\rho$ 入óros $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ \eta \eta \rho \epsilon \iota . ~$ Near akin is the use of aipeì = 'to secure a conviction', as in Apol.

12. vîv $\delta \eta$. See on 46 D above.

48 D 14. кal xápıтas: the plural is preferred to the singular, not only because Socrates is speaking for Crito as well as for himself, but because it balances the plural $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \alpha$ more neatly. It is hardly necessary to supply $\epsilon i \delta o ́ \tau \epsilon s$ from $\tau \epsilon \lambda o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon s: \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \nu \chi$ d́pı $(\chi$ ápı $\tau \alpha s$ ) is to 'pay a debt of gratitude'.
 be more logical and less grammatical.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \in \dot{\alpha}$ : see on $\dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s 46 \mathrm{D}$.

$\mu \grave{\eta}$ «is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s-\hat{\eta}$ in 48 c . $\dot{v} \pi 0 \lambda o \gamma i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ is 'to entertain a reflection pointing to the opposite line of conduct from that which we are, or ought to be, pursuing' : see on Apol. 28 B. We have the same sentiment and the same mode of expression in Apol. 28 D $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}-\mu \hat{\epsilon}-$

 'staying here' from 'standing fast' or 'holding our ground'.
 Schanz reads oüт' $\epsilon i$ after Forster. $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ is to be supplied from the preceding clause.
20. $\kappa a \lambda \omega \hat{s}-\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu-o ̋ p a ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \tau i ~ \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ : it is time for deeds, not words: supra $46 \mathrm{~A} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \dot{o} o v, \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \delta e ̀ ~ o u ̉ \delta e ̀ ~ \beta o v \lambda \epsilon u ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~$ ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \tau \iota \dot{\omega} \rho a, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \epsilon \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota$. $\delta \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ is the deliberative conjunctive.
24. $\pi a v ̂ \sigma a l . ~ I n ~ A t t i c ~ ' s t o p!' ~ i s ~ \pi a v ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ o r ~ \pi a \hat{v} \epsilon ~(n o t ~ \pi a v ́ o v, ~ 48 ~ E ~$ though in Homer $\pi a v \in \sigma$ is found). $\pi a \hat{v} \epsilon$ is the only form of this word used intransitively in good writers: the plural is $\pi \alpha v \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ and $\pi a \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$ : see Cobet V. L. pp. 264, 367, and Rutherford on Babrius 28. 8.

 for apart from the awkwardness of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \kappa о \nu \tau o s, \tau \alpha \hat{\nu} \tau \alpha \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ could only mean 'to let me remain and die' : an impossible meaning, since it leaves rav̂ra without an antecedent, Socrates as yet professing not to have made up his mind but to be willing to follow ö $\pi \eta$
 Meiser (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1874, p. 40) in transposing тầтa $\pi \rho \dot{\text { ár } \tau \epsilon \iota, ~}$
 'to act herein') depends on $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i} \pi o \lambda \lambda o v ̀ ~ \pi o \iota o \hat{u} \mu a \iota$, and is coordinate with and not subordinate to $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a \iota$, which is used absolutely. Translate: 'for I think it important to persuade you, and not to act in this without your consent'. Cron, Schanz and Kral retain the ms order, changing $\pi \in \hat{\imath} \sigma a \iota$ to $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s$, with Buttmann, Hermann and Madvig: Wohlrab alone among recent editors retains the ms
 jected as "ein erklärendes Glossem zu dem falsch verstandenem
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta}$ ๙̈коขтоs sc. $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon$ ". Göbel discusses the passage at length in his Fulda program 1882 p. 10 foll., and claims to have solved all difficulties by the change of $\pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma a \iota$ to $\pi a \hat{\imath} \sigma a \iota$ : but in reality this is
only mending one fault by two others, for (a) $\pi a \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$ would inevitably lead to ${ }^{d \prime} \kappa о \nu \tau \alpha$ : (b) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta$ ' is not 'aber nicht', but 'nicht'; i.e. it must introduce not a mere qualification, but a direct antithesis to some word in the preceding clause: and $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a \iota$ (or $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s$ ) is exactly such a word. The choice clearly lies between Meiser's view and that of Cron: I prefer the former, because (a) even if $\pi$ ei $\sigma a s$ were right I think Plato would either have written $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi 0 \lambda \lambda o \hat{v} \pi o \iota o \hat{u} \mu a \iota$ $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s ~ \sigma \epsilon$, à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \tau o s, \tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, or (less likely) $\pi \epsilon \rho \imath$
 (b) because in $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a$ $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu=$ 'do what I am doing', 'act in this matter', the force of $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ seems to me more obscure if it follows $\sigma \epsilon$ than if it follows áкоутоs.
 (with Wohlrab) Rep. IV. 432 C ö $\rho a$ ô̂̀ каì $\pi \rho \circ \theta \nu \mu o \hat{v} \kappa a \tau \iota \delta \epsilon \grave{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \dot{\nu}$
 (a meaning it never bears), but 'si forte', 'in case': in such expressions there is no real ellipse of the apodosis: see Monro's Homeric Grammar, p. 212.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} v \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rho \mathrm{X} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{v}$ is 'the outset', 'the start': from its use in such examples as the present it came to mean 'principle', as so often in Aristotle.
49 A 29. ท̂ ${ }^{\circ} v \mu \alpha^{2} \lambda_{\iota} \sigma \tau \alpha$ oln $n$, i.e. in the way to which your opinion most inclines: $\overparen{\eta}$ is adverbial and goes with oiln, as in oit $\epsilon \sigma$ aı $\tau a u ́ \tau \eta$ : ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ is not to be understood.

## CHAPTER X.

In this chapter Crito is made to admit (a) that it is wrong to requite wrong with wrong or evil with evil, and (b) that it is our duty to carry out in practice that which we have in theory admitted to be right. Introduction p. xii.

 $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \tau \epsilon \in о \nu \kappa \alpha i \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \eta \tau \epsilon \in \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$., and for the sentiment itself Apol.

 Rep. I. 335 D.


 $\tau \eta \theta \in i$ s.


 and others whether the doctrine here maintained was ever held by the historical Socrates: but I have no doubt that it was. In harmony with his egoistic principles, Socrates denied that it is ever right to wrong another, because wrongdoing has an injurious influence on one's own soul: see Introd. p. xii.
 $\eta \pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \iota$ : but as there is nothing to which the words can be referred, I agree with recent editors in omitting them. The alternative



7. ékkexvuéval. The metaphor (as Göbel remarks) is probably from losing or throwing goods overboard at sea: cf. Rep. viif. 553 в




8. $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda a l-a ̈ p a . \pi a ́ \lambda a \iota ~ g o e s ~ w i t h ~ e ̀ \lambda a ́ \theta o \mu \epsilon \nu-\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu \tau \epsilon s: ~ a ̈ p a$
 тои́т $\omega \nu \pi 0 \iota \eta \eta^{\sigma} \omega$;
$\tau \eta \lambda \iota к o l \delta \epsilon$. After $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o l \delta \epsilon$ the mss read $\gamma^{\prime} \rho \rho о \nu \tau \epsilon s \alpha^{\prime \prime \nu} \delta \rho \epsilon$ : I think with Cron and Schanz that $\gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \frac{1}{} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon s$ is a gloss on $\tau \eta \lambda c \kappa o i \delta \epsilon$. Fischer and Wohlrab defend the word on the ground that $\gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \nu \tau \epsilon s{ }^{\prime} \nu \partial \delta \rho \epsilon$ makes a good antithesis to $\pi \alpha i \delta \omega \omega$ : but the phrase $\gamma^{\hat{\epsilon}} \rho 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s \not{ }_{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ is a trifle awkward, and ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ alone seems to me more forcible as the opposite of $\pi a l \delta \omega \nu$.
9. $\sigma \pi 0 v \delta \hat{\eta}$ is emphatic, nearly $=\sigma \pi o v \delta \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ov̉ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \iota \hat{̣}$ (suggested by $\pi a i \delta \omega \nu$ in the next line).
10. $\pi \alpha i \delta(\delta \omega \nu$ oủ $\delta \in ̀ v$ סıaф́́povtes is almost a proverbial phrase, as 49 B Wohlrab remarks: compare Theaet. $177 \mathrm{~B} \dot{\eta} \dot{\rho} \eta \tau о \rho \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon i \nu \eta \pi \omega s$

 and indeed generally $\delta \alpha a \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ means 'to be better than' and not simply 'to differ'.
A. C.

If. $\pi a v \tau \grave{s}{ }^{\mu} \mu \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0} \nu=$ 'assuredly' (i.e. more than anything) is frequent in Plato, e.g. Prot. 344 B $\pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \epsilon ̂ \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi o ́ s$ є̇бть.

 $\nu \quad \mu i \grave{\zeta} \omega$ кaтà $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ бòv $\lambda 6$ б́ov. Asyndeton is regular in this kind of explanatory clause : see on Apol. 22 A. I have printed a colon before $\epsilon i \tau \epsilon \phi a \sigma i \nu$, cf. Apol. 1. c. $\partial \mu \omega s$ in line 14 thus becomes more easy and natural.


14. тó $\gamma \in$ dं $\delta$ เкєîv: see on 49 A , line 3.
kal kakòv kal airxpóv. In Gorg. 474 C foll. it is shewn that $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ is both ка́кıоע and al̈бхıоע than $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta \alpha$. Note the symmetry throughout this speech of Socrates: it begins with oúdevi $\tau \rho \dot{\sigma} \pi \varphi$ and ends with $\pi a \nu \tau i \quad \tau \rho o ́ \pi \varphi$ : and the two alternatives are presented in such a way that the one which finally prevails is placed both first and last: the order is a.b.a.b.a.
 fore': for $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa о \nu ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ is $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \omega s$. Socrates does not in this assume that he has been wronged by the laws: only by men: see on 54 C.

બ́s oi $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ol olovtal. The ordinary Greek view is well summed




 declares that this was the prevailing morality in Greece: Mem. 11.3.

 is against the supposition that this view commended itself to him, and even Pittacus, if we may trust Diogenes Laertius (1. 4. 78), had already declared against it in the memorable words $\phi i \lambda o \nu \mu \eta\rangle \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega}$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \in \chi \theta \rho o ́ v$. See Introd. p. xii.
$49 \mathrm{C} \quad$ 22. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\ell} \delta \underset{\text { è }}{ } \delta \boldsymbol{\eta} ;=$ 'once more' introduces a new departure : with $\tau i \delta \epsilon$; (infra line 24) the departure is less new: from $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \in \hat{\iota} \nu$ to какоирүєіि the transition is greater than from какоvрүєiv to àvтєкакоי'рүє̂̀.

least Crito can answer without hesitation，for какоvp $\gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ suggests the idea of a criminal or malefactor ：see L．and S．s．v．

 through the middle term $\beta \lambda \alpha \dot{\pi} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．

30．как $\operatorname{sis} \pi 0 เ \epsilon \hat{\imath} v-\pi \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \chi \eta$ vi $\pi^{\prime}$ av̉ $\tau \hat{\omega} v$ is circumlocutory for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota-$ какоирүєìv．For oủ $\delta^{\prime} \dot{a} \nu$ ȯ $\tau \iota o ̂ \nu \nu ~ \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \eta=$ ne tum quidem si quidvis patiatur，compare Rep．vil． $522 \mathrm{E} \epsilon i \kappa \alpha i \dot{o} \tau \iota o \hat{v} \nu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi a i \epsilon \iota \nu$ ： Polit． 297 B oủk ä $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os oủ $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu 0 \hat{v} \nu$ ．The subject to $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \eta$ is understood from the unexpressed subject to $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \delta \kappa \kappa \in i \nu$ and как $\hat{s}$


32．каӨоцо $\lambda_{0} \hat{\omega} v$ ：the кará points to the gradual piecemeal


 where it is said that Socrates leads one on little by little till lo！ when at the end all the little admissions are added up $\mu \epsilon \in \gamma \alpha$ тò

 doctrines are for the few and not for the many is more in the vein of Plato than of Socrates．It is possible that Socrates may have been led to hold this language by his condemnation on an unjust charge： but while actively engaged on his mission he was as far as possible from despairing，as is clear from Xen．Mem．III．5．See Intro－ duction p ．xv．

34．oîs oûv—тov́тoเs oủk ध̈ $\sigma \tau \iota$ кoเvخ̀ ßou入ท̆．Compare Apol．





36．$\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu$ ka $\alpha a \phi \rho o v \in i v:$ the many laugh at the philosopher （Rep．vir． 517 A ），and if the philosopher laughs at them，$\hat{\eta} \tau \tau o \nu a ̈ \nu$
廿vर̣̂̂）：Rep．viI． 5 I8 в．

38．кoเvตveis is used with reference to кoıvウ̀ $\beta$ ov $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\eta}$ in 38 ：so infra in 42．$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu$ in the same line $=\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ тoútov rôv خó is explained by $\dot{\omega}$ ov̇ס́є́ $\pi о \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．：compare（with Jacobs）Prot．



40．Oútє $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ảvtaסtкєîv．After these words we might expect

$$
6-2
$$

oüтє то仑̂ какоvр $\gamma \epsilon i \nu$, but as Göbel points out $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon$ ív has already been identified with какоир $\gamma \epsilon i \nu$ (in C above, line 27): and besides it is on the injustice of tò $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \kappa a \kappa о \nu \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ rather than of $\tau \dot{\delta} \kappa \alpha \kappa о \nu \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ that the rest of the dialogue turns.
49 E 42. $\tau \hat{\eta} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \hat{\eta} s:$ said with reference to $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ in 28: see note on 48 E above.
44. Tò $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тои̂тo = 'my next point': see on Apol. 39 B.
48. $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \in \rho \omega \bar{\epsilon}=$ vel potius interrogo: Socrates said his say by questions oftener than by answers: see Apol. 33 B. For $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \epsilon ́$ see above on 46 A.
50. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \pi a \tau \eta \tau \in \mathfrak{c} \boldsymbol{v}$ : to believe a theory and yet not carry it into practice is a living lie: to Socrates this seemed not only wrong, but impossible, since knowledge is virtue and oúסєis $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon \iota$ : see Introd. to Apol. p. xi.

## CHAPTER XI.

With this chapter the third division of the dialogue begins. Crito has now admitted the major premise which is to determine the action of Socrates, viz. that under no circumstances is it right to do wrong or requite wrong with wrong or evil with evil. The minor premise is still wanting, and to establish this Socrates introduces the Laws of Athens, who endeavour to prove that if he complied with Crito's invitation, Socrates would be guilty of wrongdoing, and retaliation in wrong-doing. In this chapter they urge that escape would be wrong because it would mean the entire negation of the State and civic life. See Introduction pp. x-xiv.
r. Ék $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mathbf{0} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \omega \nu=$ 'in the light of this', 'starting from these premises': so in 48 в $\epsilon \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\nu} \mu о \lambda 0 \gamma 0 \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$.


 to oîs= roútocs ä: for a similar case see Apol. 37 B ávì quútov $\delta \grave{\eta}$
 оîd' ठ̈ть кака̀ oै ôvта.
 Crito sees but too clearly what the conclusion will be.
 is characteristic of Socrates to let the Laws speak for themselves:
like Plato he was nothing if not clear and emphatic．For a similar example see Theaet． 166 A foll．I think too that Plato wished to save Socrates from the charge of selfishness and lack of feeling， when his friends were so deeply moved，and hence the fatal argument comes not from his mouth but from the Laws．
$\mu e ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota \nu \quad \mathfrak{\eta} \mu i ̂ \nu:$ the dative depends on $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s:$ Cron com－

 runaway slave or a deserter，and these words are added to spare Crito＇s feelings，＂mitigandae orationis causa＂（Stallbaum）．For the Greek Stallbaum compares Legg．I． 633 A $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s$ ä $\lambda \lambda \eta s$


 is added with a view to $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \dot{\partial} \lambda_{\iota \nu}$（line $1_{5}$ ）and $\dot{\eta} \pi \dot{\partial} \lambda_{\iota s}$（22）after－ wards．The editors refer to Prot． 319 D $\tau$ ò кo七 $\nu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ oưt $\omega$ s ${ }^{\text {é }} \chi \in \epsilon$ and Cic．Verr．II．2．II4 a communi Siciliae．It is possible that Cicero had the whole passage in view when he wrote （Cat．I．17）Quae（sc．patria）tecum Catilina sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur．

Ir．ėmıotávtes is regularly used of a vision＇standing over＇ one：see Symp．i92 D（quoted on line 8 above）．The word occurs naturally to Socrates，who had a devout belief in visions：see on
 ad caput adstitit．

12．ä入入o $\tau \iota \geqslant$ ’ $=$ aliudne quid quam？i．e．nonne？see on Apol． $24 \mathrm{C}: \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda 0 \tau \iota$ alone can bear the same meaning．With $\hat{\oplus} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \iota \chi \epsilon \rho \epsilon i s$ contrast $45 \mathrm{C} \bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$ ：the influence of the preceding ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi$ causes $\hat{\psi}$ to be preferred to the more usual ${ }^{\circ}$ ．
 deictic：the voice should pause before and after it．The laws and constitution of Athens are arraigned before Socrates：whence $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0$－ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$＇to kill＇，＇destroy＇，viz．by giving an adverse verdict．So in Legg．IX． 857 A，where the metaphor is still kept up：$\pi \rho \circ \delta \delta$ ó $\eta$
 the parricide，as it were，of his country＇s laws．See Introduction pp，vii－viii．

тò oòv $\mu$ ќpos：＇as far as lies with you＇：so in 45 D above．In $\hat{\eta}$ ठокє $\hat{\imath} \sigma 0 \iota$ оî̀ $\nu \tau \epsilon$ it is better to regard $\delta о к \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma O \iota$ as parenthetical （＇think you＇）and understand $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ with oîo $\tau \in$ than to understand
 see on 43 D above.
 but $\epsilon$ ival here $=$ 'exist' $)(\dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta a \iota$ : it is not the copula.
16. Sikat is here 'judgments', 'decisions' not 'lawsuits': this use is frequent in Homer, but rare in Attic. $\gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \in \nu a \iota=\delta \iota \kappa a-$ $\sigma \theta \in i \hat{\sigma} a \iota$ as in line 20.
17. áкироt is opposed to кúpıaц: see line 21 .
19. ả $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s} \tau \epsilon$ каi $\rho \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$ : the imagery of a trial is still kept up: see Introduction p. vii.
 that throughout all this passage there is an allusion to the custom of appointing $\sigma v v \dot{\eta} \gamma o p o t$ or advocates to defend any law which it was proposed to repeal.
21. ört introduces the direct quotation as in Apol. 21 C
 گ $\neq \eta \sigma \theta a$ : infr. 50 c .
50 C 22. $\eta$ 认íkel $\gamma$ áp: the force of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is clear ('Yes, I do mean to wrong the laws) for' etc. Instead of $\eta^{\prime} \delta i \kappa \epsilon s$ Heindorf requires $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ : the present of this verb is frequently used of an injury committed in the past because the injury is supposed to continue till it is atoned for. But Socrates speaks as one who has outlived the sense of injury: the imperfect $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \epsilon \iota$ is thus in keeping with the spirit of his motto $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \phi \eta \mu i \not q \chi \rho \eta े \tau \varepsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \hat{a} \nu$ (Phaed. 117 E ).
23. Ékpıvєv: the Aorist, not the imperfect, in spite of $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \epsilon \iota$.

## CHAPTER XII.

The Laws proceed to argue that Socrates is their child and slave, bound to render them all the obedience due to parents and masters, or rather more, because one's fatherland should be more to one than parents.
2. kai $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha=$ 'this too', viz. the reservation that you were to question our decrees, and disobey them if they seemed to you wrong. The antecedent to $\tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ is implied in the words $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{i} \kappa \epsilon \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho-\epsilon ้ \kappa \rho \iota \nu \epsilon \nu$
 connection and leaves кai unexplained: the meaning of кai is fixed by the following line: $\bar{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \in \mathcal{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu-\delta \iota \kappa \dot{\alpha} \zeta \eta$, i. e. ' or to abide by the
decisions delivered by the State', sc. without any clause of reservation.
3. taîs $\delta$ lkaıs: $\delta \ell \kappa a \iota=$ 'decisions', 'judgments', as in 50 B , line 16.
4. $a v ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta a v \mu \alpha ́\} o \mu \mu, \epsilon \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta v \tau \omega \nu=$ 'should be surprised at their language': $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ is regularly followed by a genitive of the person: Goodwin, Gk. Gr. 222.
5. öтt: see on 50 в. Infra in line $7 \mathrm{kal}=$ 'also'.
 periphrasis: Stallbaum refers to Phaed. 75D кaì ̇̀v $\tau a i ̂ s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \iota \nu$

10. $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ úval: see on 50 B , line 13 . $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ corresponds 50 D to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ in line 14 : the second question thus becomes more vivid: for a similar case compare 48 A and 53 B. $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu=\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \alpha \iota$ ̇́ $\pi \sigma \circ \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$ 'called into existence': Aristotle has $\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ aủrúv (sc. $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ oủ $\rho a \nu \grave{\nu} \nu)=\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta$ a aủtò̀ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (De Cael. II. $283{ }_{3}^{\text {b }}$
31). The idiom is extremely common in Plato.
 ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$. Note $\lambda a \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\prime} \omega \omega$ in the sense of 'I take to wife': so
 remarks that the imperfect calls up the circumstances and provisions of the courtship (if there was any) and wedding: for the collocation of the imperfect and the aorist cf. infra 52 C oü $\omega \omega \sigma \phi \dot{\delta} \delta \rho \alpha \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\mathrm{s}} \dot{\eta} \rho \circ \hat{\nu}$

12. тoúzoss $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ тoîs $\nu$ ó $\mu$ ols: here and in line 17 Schanz follows Hirschig in bracketing roîs $\nu$ óuoss ( $\nu o ́ \mu o \iota$ ) : but the addition of these words makes the Greek far more explicit and emphatic. тoútors is deictic.
13. тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{i}$ тov̀s $\gamma$ á $\mu$ ovs: Cron remarks that Socrates is thinking chiefly of the laws which established the legal validity of marriage and as a consequence the legitimacy of the children. Some account of the laws relating to marriage is given in Becker's Charicles E. T. pp. 473-498.
14. Éxovoเv is probably the participle : $\tau \iota$ points to this (Cron). For $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} v$. note on line 10 above.
${ }^{1} 5$. трофŋ́v $\tau \epsilon$ кal $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i \alpha v$. Plato frequently uses this expression to denote the upbringing and education of a child: e.g.
 $\tau \rho o \phi \eta$ is the wider term, including the general care of the body: in $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a$ the care of the soul is the prominent idea.
16. ท̂ ov кa入ติs: $\eta$-the less authenticated reading-would $=$ Lat. An? $\hat{\eta}$ ov is simply Nonne?
oi éml тоv́тoเs тєтаүнévol vó $\mu$ ol: the antecedent to тoútoıs is
 $\lambda_{0 \nu \tau \epsilon s}$ is not to be pressed: it is doubtful to what extent Athenian parents were compelled by law to educate their children: see Becker's Charicles E. T. p. 228.
 cation-the end being to produce a sound mind in a sound body:
 $\nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}, \dot{\eta} \delta \prime \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} \mu 0 v \sigma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$. The latter in its wider signification included $\gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \alpha$ (reading, writing, and arithmetic), кıө́ápıбıs (lyre-playing), and learning by heart passages of the poets, especially Homer. See Becker's Charicles E. T. 226-236.
 and $\gamma v \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ : whether $\mu о v \sigma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ and $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ were rightly taught is quite another question. It is impossible to believe that Socrates approved of Athenian methods of teaching : for he never wearied of attacking the ignorance of his countrymen, and knowledge according to him could be taught. In the Protagoras ( 339 foll.) Plato makes him prove by an elaborate caricature of the popular way of expounding the poets that no true education comes from that quarter. Plato himself rejected the popular education both in its actual curriculum and still more in respect of its method: see Rep. VII. $\mathbf{5}_{2} \mathrm{I}$ C foll.

єícv: see on 47 в above.
20. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{d} \phi \eta$ : $\hat{\epsilon} \xi-$ signifies that Socrates was no longer a child: so Ar. Nub. 1380 由่vaí $\chi v \nu \tau \epsilon, \sigma^{\prime} \epsilon \xi \xi \in \rho \in \psi a$.
21. kal हैkyovos kail סov̂̀os: Cron compares Hdt. viI. IO4,
 oủ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a ~ \epsilon ̇ \lambda \epsilon u ́ \theta \epsilon \rho o l ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \cdot ~ Є ̈ \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota ~ \gamma a ́ \rho ~ \sigma \phi \iota ~ \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ ó $\tau \eta s \nu b \mu o s$. See also


22. aủtós tє kal oi $\sigma$ ol mpóyovol: Socrates is, so to speak, $\delta о \hat{\lambda} \lambda o s \kappa \dot{\alpha} \kappa \delta o v ́ \lambda \omega \nu$. With this form of expression compare Apol.

 on a level with ours?' (Church): кai=atque, as in pariter atque. The $\kappa a i$ after $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is explanatory, as in 50 D , line 1 I .
 argument: you may not retaliate on your parent or your master :
how much less upon your country and her laws! Compare Apol.

 $\sigma 0 \phi o \hat{\nu} \tau \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \delta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu-, \epsilon \in \nu \tau \alpha \hat{v} \theta a \delta \epsilon \grave{\epsilon}-\lambda i \pi o \iota \mu \iota \tau \eta ̀ \nu \tau d \dot{\xi} \iota \nu$ : see my note on the passage. Here, as usual, ${ }^{\prime} \rho \alpha$ expresses surprise : the presence of $\alpha p a$ in both clauses makes the antithesis more pointed, and increases the rhetorical effect: Cron compares Prot. $3^{2} 5$ B-C $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu$ è $\nu$

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \iota^{\prime} \kappa \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \rho \circ \pi a i, \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \delta^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} \rho \alpha$ o $\delta \delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa о \nu \tau a \iota$. The position of $\sigma o l$ between the preposition and its noun is noteworthy: it is the less remarkable, because $\sigma o \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha ~ i s ~ n e a r l y ~ e q u i v a l e n t ~ t o ~ \sigma o ̀ \nu ~$ $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha$ : cf. Eur. Med. $324 \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon$ gová $\omega \omega \nu$ : and the well-known "Lydia dic per omnes te deos oro" of Hor. Carm. I. 8. i.
26. oủk $\begin{gathered} \\ \xi \\ \text { i̛oov ท̂v : the imperfect implies that Socrates’ father }\end{gathered}$ is dead. oúk goes closely with $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \mathfrak{l} \bar{\sigma} o v:$ beware of taking it as= nonne?

 is the apodosis, for Greek (like Latin) prefers the more direct and dogmatic mode of expression ( $\hat{\eta} \nu$, erat, rather than $\hat{\eta} \nu a^{\prime} \nu$, esset): Goodwin MT. 97-
 equality of rights, Socrates might retaliate: otherwise not. As oủk

 just as in $3 \mathrm{r}-33$ we have a positive clause with $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ to explain the
 rather than oúk $\hat{\epsilon} \xi$ loov. Perhaps he was anxious to avoid the accumulation of negatives.



 serve as passives to $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega \delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$ etc. : see on Apol. i7 A.
 Clouds 1409 foll. Phidippides beats his father Strepsiades, justify-



 falsely brought against Socrates was that he set sons against their parents: see Introduction to Apol. p. xxx.
 which Stallbaum vainly defends. The choice lies between $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ l $\sigma o v$
 both because it changes less, and because I dislike the cadence of the first : I think Plato, had he chosen to repeat $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \mathfrak{l} \sigma o v$, would have omitted $\sigma \circ$. I have added a mark of interrogation after ë $\sigma \tau a \iota \sigma 0 \iota$ : see on line 32.
 Note the emphatic $\sigma \dot{\epsilon})(\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s$ and in the next line $\sigma \dot{v})(\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s: ~ I ~$ follow Göbel and Kral in writing $\sigma \grave{\epsilon}$ against $\sigma \epsilon$ of the MSS.
 -as we should naturally expect after $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, a vivid question is substituted: compare on 50 D line 10 . At the same time a better antithesis is provided for $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathrm{~S} \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{u} \nu a \iota$, and the awkwardness of the two accusatives in кai $\sigma \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s \kappa \tau \lambda$. is avoided. For $\kappa a i-\delta \epsilon ́$ see following note.
 no case of $\kappa a i-\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ in a dependent sentence. This example is instructive as to the origin of the combination $\kappa \alpha-\delta \epsilon=$ 'and also': the $\kappa a l$ goes with the intervening words (cf. Aesch. Prom. 972-973 $\chi \lambda \iota \delta \omega \hat{\omega}$;
 $\lambda \epsilon \quad \gamma \omega)$. The precise force of $\delta \hat{\varepsilon}$ in this place is difficult to explain. The editors say that it is used "ad augendam oppositionis gravitatem: pro simplici кal $\sigma \dot{v} \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ d i c t u m ~ e s t ~: ~ к a i ~ \sigma u ̀ ~ \delta \grave{~} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s, u s u$ haud infrequenti" (Stallbaum). For this 'not uncommon use' no parallels are quoted: and I prefer to regard it as the $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ found sometimes in interrogative sentences, e.g. Prot. $3 \mathrm{I} 2 \mathrm{~A} \sigma \dot{v} \delta \epsilon \in, \hat{\eta} \nu \delta^{\prime} \epsilon ่ \gamma \omega ́, \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu}$,

34. тav̂ta $\pi 0 \iota \omega \hat{v}$ sc. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{s}$ : cf. 50 E line 24 and note on 44 D $\pi o \iota 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota \delta \hat{\varepsilon} \tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0$ ö $\tau \iota a \mathfrak{a} \nu \tau \cup ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota \nu$. $\tau \hat{\eta} a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \not q$ is bitterly sarcastic: Socrates hábitually professed $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s$ : see Apol. 30 A and 4 I E: $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota$ indeed was almost a technical term in Socrates' preaching: see Xen. Mem. I. 2. 3, 4 etc. Sarcasm is frequently brought out by adding a qualifying participial clause at the end of a



scripts of Plato often fluctuate between $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda o_{-}^{-}$ $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 s:$ here the Bodleian has $\epsilon \in \pi \mu \epsilon \lambda 6 \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$. On the adverbial phrase $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \dot{c} a$ see supra note on $\dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s{ }_{4} 6$ D.
 other mss read $\hat{\eta}$. $\quad \eta$ is a far supérior reading : for the Laws having first taken Socrates at his own estimate ( $\dot{\delta} \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i \neq q \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi(\mu \epsilon \lambda \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s)$ now proceed to take him at other people's. It is clear from Apol. 18 в that $\sigma 0 \phi$ ós (like $\phi \rho o \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta \dot{s}$ ) was almost a nickname of Socrates. Here of course the word is used with bitter irony, as indeed it often was in Socrates' time: cf. Meno $75 \mathrm{C} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma o \phi \hat{\omega} \nu-$

 which Socrates and the Sophists were thought to be the professors) tended to lessen the hold of the State upon the individual : see Ar. Nubes 889 -I 104 .
$\mu \eta \tau \rho o ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ к a l ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ́ s . ~ F o r ~ t h e ~ o r d e r ~ c o m p a r e ~ w i t h ~ C r o n ~ P r o t . ~$

 $\tau \epsilon \rho a$. For the sentiment Stallbaum compares Cic. De Off. I. 57 "Cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propinqui, familiares: sed omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est: pro qua quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere, si ei sit profuturus?" That one's country has the first claim on one, and one's family and friends only the second, was the recognised principle of both Greek and Roman civic life, during their most flourishing periods. In setting self-study above political life Socrates was unconsciously preaching a view whose logical issue amounted to the dissolution of the old life which it was his aim to restore.
 $\tau i \mu \cos$ is one of the loftiest epithets that can be applied to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \cdot$ $\pi \iota \nu a$ : $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu o ́ s$ is applied to $\tau \grave{\alpha} \theta \epsilon i a$ as well : ä $\gamma \iota o s$ almost exclusively to $\tau d \theta \epsilon i \alpha$. Translate 'worthier and more august and more sacred'.
 pression: Cron compares Hdt. II. 172 кai $̇ \dot{\nu} \nu$ oủ $\delta \epsilon \mu \iota \hat{\eta} \mu \circ i \rho \eta$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta \in\{\chi \circ \nu$.
39. àvӨpótors roîs voûv 'éxovort: few and far between: see
 $\beta \rho a \chi$ ú $\tau$.
41. кal ท̄ $\pi \epsilon_{i}^{i} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ sc. $\delta \in \hat{i}$. For $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ used absolutely cf. Apol. $35 \mathrm{C} \delta \iota \delta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha i) \pi \epsilon \hat{\ell} \epsilon \iota \nu$, and supra $48 \mathrm{E} \pi \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \alpha \iota \sigma \epsilon \epsilon_{\text {. }}$.
 This is to explain $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{d} \nu \tau \iota \pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \eta \pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$ of line 42.

 for his country at Potidaea (432 B.C.), Delium (424 B.C.) and Amsphipolis (422 b.c.): see on Apol. 28 e.
 give way (it may be slowly) before the enemy, rather than remain to die ( $\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta a \nu o u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ in 45) : cf. Rep. VIII. 555 E $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \dot{a} \in l \dot{v} \pi \in i$ $\kappa о \nu \tau \alpha-\tau \iota \tau \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa о \nu \tau \epsilon s$. ávax $\omega \rho \in \hat{\nu}$ is to retreat: Symp. 221 A á $\pi \grave{\partial}$ $\Delta \eta \lambda i o v \phi v \gamma \hat{\eta} \dot{a} \nu \epsilon \chi \dot{\omega} \rho \in \iota \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \nu$. $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau a ́ \xi \iota \nu$ suggests the $\lambda \iota \pi o \tau a \xi i o u \gamma_{i} a \phi \eta$. The whole clause is meant to elaborate
 $\pi 0 \iota \eta \tau \notin o \nu \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$.
 frequent idiom. Stallbaum quotes Gorg. 492 D $\tau$ às $\mu \grave{\Sigma} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i a s$
 $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau a s \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\rho} \omega \sigma \tau \nu$ aủraîs $\dot{\alpha} \mu \delta \theta \epsilon \nu \gamma \epsilon \in \pi 0 \theta \epsilon \nu \dot{\nu} \tau \circ \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$.
50. $\beta$ เá ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$. $\beta \iota \alpha ́ \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ and $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ are often connected or opposed: cf. Gorg. $5^{17}$ в $\pi \epsilon i \theta 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s \kappa a i \beta \iota a \zeta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota \epsilon \in \pi i$ тои̂то:
 раи́клпроу.

## CHAPTER XIII.

In this chapter the Laws insist that to remain in Athens is to have pledged oneself to obey them, for emigration is free to all.
2. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ is of course predicative, like ov $\delta i \kappa \alpha \iota \alpha$ in the next line.
 on 50 E .
 asmuch as we have given permission'. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \beta$ ou $\lambda o \mu \epsilon \in \nu \varphi$ depends on
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\partial} \nu-\nu \dot{\prime} \mu o u s$ is also to be taken with $\epsilon \mathfrak{\xi} o v \sigma l a \nu \pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \eta \kappa \in ́ \nu a \iota:$ the permission is ipso facto accorded as soon as the $\delta о \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma i a$ is past.
 belongs to $\pi \rho \circ a \gamma \rho \rho \in \dot{o} \rho \mu \in \nu$. The apparent awkwardness of the sen-
tence is due to the use of $\epsilon \xi$ ovoial without a following infinitive: but this use is not uncommon in Plato, e.g. Rep. viil. 557 D where it is said of democracy $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \iota \omega ิ \nu$ Єै $\chi \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \alpha ̀ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \xi 0 v \sigma i a \nu:$ $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ ovoia was perhaps one of the familiar watchwords of Athenian democracy: cf. Thuc. vil. 69 ن́то $\mu \iota \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu — \tau \hat{\eta} s — \alpha \dot{\nu} \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \tau o v \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ - $\dot{\epsilon} \xi 0 v \sigma i a s$.
 Athenian was enrolled in the $\lambda \eta \xi \iota a \rho \chi \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \hat{i} \nu \quad$ or register of his deme, after the usual $\delta о к \iota \mu \alpha \sigma i a$ or examination. This particular examination was called $\delta о к \iota \mu a \sigma i \alpha ~ \epsilon i s ~ a ̈ \nu \delta \rho a s ~ t o ~ d i s t i n g u i s h ~$ it from the $\delta о к ц \mu \sigma i a!$ which the various magistrates had to undergo before entering upon office. It marked the coming of age of the young Athenian citizen: but it was not till he was 20 that he took part in the public assembly and attained the full privileges of citizenship. From 18 to 20 he had to serve in the $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi 0 \lambda o t$ or patrol which guarded the frontiers of Attica. Stallbaum compares Aeschin. in Timarch. § 18 є́ $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\alpha} \nu \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \in \gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\eta}$ єis $\tau \grave{̀} \lambda \eta \xi \iota a \rho \chi \iota \kappa$ ò $\nu$


II. $\lambda a \beta o ́ v \tau a, ~ i n ~ s p i t e ~ o f ~ t h e ~ p r e c e d i n g ~ d a t i v e ~ \hat{\Psi}: ~ c f . ~ E u t h y-~$


 оікктоу.
12. kal ov̉ $\delta \epsilon$ is- $\beta$ ov́ $\lambda \eta$ ral: omitted by mistake in $B$.
14. aimockiav: an Athenian colony: contrast $\mu \in \tau о \kappa \in i v i \nu$ in 15. ápé $\sigma \kappa о \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ is changed by Madvig (Adv. Crit. I. 369) into $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \kappa \mu \epsilon \nu$ :

 why one might wish to emigrate: tr. 'if any of you wants to go to a colony, supposing we and the State should not satisfy him'.
 (as opposed to a particular or special) conditional sentence: Dem.
 $\nu \in \tau$ aı каl кєขóv: Goodwin MT. ıо8.
 for $\mu \epsilon \tau о \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \not{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda о \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu, \mu \epsilon \tau о \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ might have been substituted. See Goodwin MT. 24.
 with us'.
21. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\epsilon} \nu \nu \eta$ rais: so $B$, rightly: inferior mSS have $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \dot{\eta}$ rals. " $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \tau a i$ sunt genitores: $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \hat{\eta} \tau a \iota$ gentiles.-Legg. XI. 928 D $\delta \iota a-$

 $\tau o u$ s̀ $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon i$ is". Wohlrab. MSS however do not always observe this rule.
22. трофє̂ैбь: Socrates, so to speak, would have paid no $\tau \rho о ф \in i a:$ Rep. VII 520 в.
 taken with $\dot{o} \mu о \lambda о \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$. For the present $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ cf. 50 C $\hat{\eta}$ каi $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda o ́ \gamma \eta \tau 0-\eta \geqslant \epsilon \in \mu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \delta i \kappa \alpha \iota s: ~ a n d ~ i n f r . ~ 52 ~ D ~ \dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \eta-$ $\kappa \epsilon ́ v a \iota \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. In each of these passages Madvig (Adv. Crit. I. 370 note 1) changes the present to the future infinitive, on the ground that $\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \pi o \iota \epsilon i \hat{\nu}=$ confiteor me facere, promitto me facturum $=\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda \sigma \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \pi \circ \iota \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ (not $\pi o \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ). The truth is that $\dot{\dot{o}} \mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \epsilon \mathrm{i} \nu \mathrm{has}$ two meanings, viz. 'to confess', and to 'bargain' or 'promise': and, since the word 'promise' itself implies futurity, it may even in this sense be followed by a present infinitive, although the future is preferred, when the notion of futurity is more prominent. Just so in English we can say 'I promise to do' as well as 'I promise that I will do'. The same distinction holds in my
 $\nu о \mu i \zeta \omega, \delta о к \omega \hat{\omega}$, єiкós є́бть etc. with the present and future infinitive: although Madvig, Cobet, and the stricter school of critics generally insist that the notion of futurity must be expressed by the infinitive as well. See Madvig Adv. Crit. I. I 56 foll., Cobet Var. Lect. 97 foll., Rutherford's Babrius p. 13, and on the other hand Kühner Gr, Gr. II. p. 163 ff.
 is to propose some course of action, without, at the same time, excluding an alternative: thís is still further brought out in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \iota \in \dagger \tau \omega \nu$ סvoî̀ $\theta \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho a \kappa \tau \lambda$. ả $\gamma \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$ є́ $\pi \iota \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ suggests the angry tyrant: Gorg. 5 Іо в $\tau u ́ \rho a \nu \nu o s-a ̈ \gamma \rho ı o s ~ к a l ~ a ̀ \pi a i \delta \epsilon u t o s: ~ R e p . ~ I . ~$
 the asyndeton see on $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o a \hat{\imath} \tau \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \tau 47 \mathrm{~A}$ above. I have printed a colon before $\pi \rho \circ \tau, \theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu$ as in 49 B.

## CHAPTER XIV.

It is here argued that Socrates, if he were to abscond, would more than any other Athenian be guilty of a breach of bargain, because throughout all his life, even during the trial as well as before, he had shewn that Athens was more to him than any other city.
 effect of omitting $\hat{\omega}$ is to increase the impressiveness, since $\hat{\omega}$ $\Sigma$ 自крates is the regular mode of address: in English we obtain the same effect by exactly the opposite means.

4. ėv roîs $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$. See above on $\notin \nu$ тoîs $\beta a \rho u ́ \tau a \tau \alpha 43$ C.
5. каӨáттоьvто. каӨánтєбӨal (in Homer with acc., in Attic with gen.) is 'to fasten on', 'attack': Thuc. vi. 16. I $\dot{\alpha} \nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$

9. $\tau \circ$ víc $\nu$ refers forward to the clause introduced by öт८.
II. SLaфєрóvт由s: differently from, i.e. more than : so too $\delta \iota a-$ $\phi \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu$. For the repetition of $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \rho \dot{\jmath} \nu \tau \omega s$ in the protasis cf. Apol.
 $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \iota \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda \omega \dot{\lambda} \eta \eta$.
 Olympicos, Nemeaeos, Isthmios, Pythios, ad quos spectandos ex universa Graecia homines confluebant''. Stallbaum.
14. $\epsilon_{\xi} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$. An hypothetical clause oú $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ảp is now followed by an unconditional statement of fact. After $\epsilon \xi \bar{\eta} \backslash \theta \in S$ in inferior MSS and in the margin of B are found the words ö $\tau \iota \mu \grave{\eta}$ ä $\pi a \xi$ єis $i \sigma \theta \mu o ́ v$. The interpretation (for such it probably is) was already in the text used by Athenaeus: see v. 216 в

 we find any mention of such a journey, and at least one passage

 $\pi \alpha \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi \iota \epsilon \mathcal{\epsilon} \nu \iota$. Diogenes Laertius seems to have found the story in Favorinus, but not in Plato: he also attributes to Aristotle (no doubt wrongly) a statement to the effect that Socrates visited Delphi


 polis: see on 5 I B above, and Apol. 28 e.






 pendent on the word (ė $\left.\pi \nmid \theta v \mu^{\prime} a\right)$ upon which the infinitive itself

 $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ oiki ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon l \nu$. So in Latin quarum potiendi spe (Cic. de Fin. I. 60).




20. $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon \not{d} \lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha i=$ 'and in particular'. The $\tau \dot{d} \tau \epsilon \not{d} \lambda \lambda a$ goes grammatically with $\dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda\langle\gamma \in \epsilon s$, not with $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Cron) or with каi є̇по入ı七évov to be supplied from it (Stallbaum, Wohlrab, Göbel): to beget children in the city was virtually to pledge oneself ( $\dot{j}$ одо$\dot{\gamma} \in \hat{\nu})$ to obey its laws.
21. Etг тolivvv. тoivvy = 'moreover', as often in Plato and the orators. Apol. 33 E.
22. $\phi u \vee \hat{\eta} s \tau \tau \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota=$ ' to propose the penalty of exile'. Cf.
 $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \iota \tau \epsilon$. In an $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \tau \mu \eta \tau \dot{\sigma}$, like Socrates' trial, it was the duty of the accused, should he be found guilty, to propose a counter penalty to that demanded by the prosecutor. Socrates proposed a fine of 30 minae: see Apol. 38 в.


25. Teقvával: see on $\tau \in \theta \nu a ́ v a l$ in 43 C above.

 тарбутas.
27. évтpémel. 'Turn to' naturally passes into 'give heed to', 'regard': so advertere in Latin.
52 D 28. Sraфөєipat: because the Laws are personified: see Introd. p. vii.
29. aimodıסpárкetv is the regular word to denote the running away of a slave: see on 50 A above.
 in 5 I E.

 $\lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi$ is bracketed by Göbel, after Hoenebeek : but the words serve to emphasize $\epsilon \rho \gamma \varphi-$ - with deeds, not with words'. It is implied that a verbal compact is less binding than one in which deeds take the place of words. The opposition of $\lambda$ óros and $\epsilon$ epov is familiar from Thucydides. For á $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{a}$ see note on 47 в.
 deliberative conjunctive: like imperatival expressions generally, the deliberative conjunctive can be used in subordinate as well as in principal clauses: as here the full construction is äd入o $\tau i \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \vec{\eta}$
 $\lambda \alpha \gamma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ i.e. 'unless perhaps we are to get off'. See Postgate in Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Vol. iII. Part I. pp. 50-55.
37. ảv фaîcv: for the position of $\alpha \nu \nu$ compare Phaed. 87 A $\tau i$

38. ทipâs av̉тoús. aủroús seems to emphasize $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ : there is no reflexive meaning. Cron compares Phaed. $79 \mathrm{~A} \not \approx \lambda_{0} \tau \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$
 tures $\sigma a u \tau o \hat{v}$, comparing 54 C : at first sight there seems no occasion for the unusually emphatic mode of expression. I think the meaning is 'bargains made actually with us': bad as it always is to break a bargain, it is still worse when the party to it is one's




 ${ }_{15-16}$ and IV. 4. 15, and often in Plato e.g. Prot. 342 A foll. and Rep. VIII. $544 \mathrm{C} \eta \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \pi \grave{̀} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu} \epsilon \in \pi \alpha \iota \nu$ ov $\mu \epsilon \in \eta, \dot{\eta} \mathrm{K} \rho \eta \tau \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$
 in Crete and Sparta was their implicit obedience to the law: they formed the best possible illustration of his principle-ro $\delta i \kappa \alpha \ldots \nu$ is тò $\nu o ́ \mu \mu \mu \nu \nu$ : see Introd. p. xiii. є́ка́бтотє sc. quotiescumque de iis loqueris (Stallbaum).
 of a world beyond the pale of Hellenism, if we may trust Phaed.

 should be noted that oú $\delta \epsilon$ goes closely with oú $\delta \epsilon \mu l a \nu$ : it of course has nothing to do with the preceding oüre.
53 A 46. é $\lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \sigma \alpha s:$ comparative of $\dot{\partial} \lambda i \gamma \alpha-\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \sigma \alpha$. For the statement itself see note on $\bar{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$ in $5_{2}$ в above
47. ává $\pi \eta p o \iota$ are "quicumque carent vel membro aliquo et parte corporis vel certe eius usu". Fischer. For the $a^{2} \nu a$ - cf. $a^{2} \nu a-$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon \omega s, a \dot{\nu} \alpha \pi \tau \mu \pi \lambda a ́ v a \iota$ in their medical sense : see on Apol. 32 C.
 is placed for emphasis at the end of the sentence as $\epsilon i \kappa \delta \tau \omega$ is so


50. ávev vó $\mu \omega \nu$ goes closely with $\pi \delta \dot{\delta} \lambda \iota s$ : 'a city without laws'. The other meaning which suggests itself-' who could like a state without liking her laws?'-cannot be got out of the Greek : ăvev
 could like a state which had no laws : you like your state, therefore you like her laws. Schanz (after Hirschig) brackets $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu o ̈ \tau \iota-a ̈ \nu \in \nu$ $\nu o ́ \mu \omega \nu$ : but the clause contains a valuable and strictly relevant idea, viz. that a $\pi \dot{\delta} \lambda \iota s a_{d} \nu \in v \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ is a $\pi \delta \lambda_{l c s} a ̈ \pi o \lambda c s$.
 oún $\epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \in i ̂ s$ (so Schanz with the second hand in B): cf. $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \epsilon$ s and $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta a i \nu \epsilon \iota$ in $5^{2} \mathrm{D}$.
 the form of expression cf. 53 E oúd $\epsilon i s$ ôs $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}$; $\grave{\sigma} \omega \omega s, a ̈ \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \nu a \lambda \nu \pi \hat{\eta} s$ : see also $53 \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{D}$ and 54 b.
 being laughed at'. This reappears in 53 D. тò катаүє́ $\lambda a \sigma \tau o v$
 often $=$ 'funny' 'amusing'. Symp. 189 в (loquitur Aristophanes)

 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha$.

## CHAPTER XV.

The Laws now reply in detail to the arguments of Crito: see Chapters III-v and compare Introduction pp. viii-ix. Escape will bring danger on his friends, misery and disgrace upon himself, and to say the least will leave his children in no way better provided.

1. $\sigma \kappa o ́ \pi \epsilon \iota ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ \delta \eta \eta^{\prime}$ 'Just consider'. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is introductory: see on 44 A .
$\pi \alpha \rho a \beta \dot{\alpha}$ каi ${ }^{\xi} \xi \bar{\xi} \alpha \mu a \rho \tau \alpha ́ v \omega \nu$. Note the difference of tense: an $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a$ remains so till it is expiated. Cf. $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \kappa \iota$ in 50 C , where see note. tav̂̃a in тav̂ra mapaßás is not 'these duties' (Göbel), but 'these transgressions': a cognate accusative.
 of sound, and also perhaps because $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \epsilon \iota o c$ is still felt to be an adjective.
2. kaì aủroi $\phi \in u ́ y \in เ v={ }^{5}$ et ipsi exulare': sc. as well as you : $\kappa \alpha l ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ i.q. árıuol $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ s c$. by banishment. On $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ see above, note on 44 B. The Laws here reply to Crito's pleading in 44 E and 45 E .
 $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i v$, and $\stackrel{\varkappa}{\epsilon} \mu \beta \rho a \chi \nu$ all mean much the same: the first generally goes with adjectives, the second with oú $\delta \epsilon i$ is or $\pi \hat{\alpha} s$; the third is found

3. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu^{\prime} v$ : the second alternative comes infra in $D \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$
 on $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \not{\nu} \nu$ in 50 D .
4. © $\eta^{\beta} \beta a_{\epsilon}$. For $\Theta \dot{\eta} \beta a s \delta \epsilon$ : $\zeta$ was in fact pronounced $d z$ : see Gustav Meyer, Griechische Grammatik ${ }^{2}$ p. 219. So 'A $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu a \zeta \epsilon ~ \theta \dot{u} \rho a \zeta{ }_{\zeta}$ $\chi \alpha \mu \hat{\jmath} \zeta \epsilon$. Note the double accent in Mérapádé (so Bekker, Cron, Schanz, Göbel: Wohlrab however reads Me $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho a \delta \varepsilon$ and Kral M $\epsilon-$ $\gamma a \rho \alpha \dot{ } \delta \epsilon): \delta \epsilon$ is enclitic. The constitution of Thebes and Megara was oligarchical : hence $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu о \mu o u ̂ \nu \tau a \iota \gamma \grave{a} \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \delta \dot{\tau} \epsilon \rho \alpha \iota$ is said (not without a touch of sarcasm) from Socrates' point of view.
 you approve of their constitution, you have violated your own, and may violate theirs next, now that you have ceased to believe that $\delta i x a t o \nu$ is $\nu 6 \mu \mu \mu \nu \nu$. $\tau 0 u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ is masculine.
5. $\mathbf{v} \pi \circ \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \psi o v \tau a i ́ \sigma \epsilon=$ 'will eye you askance'. So in Symp.

$\dot{v} \pi 0$ - is 'from under the eyebrows': i.e. with a scowling expression ( $\tau \alpha v \rho \eta \delta \dot{o} \nu \dot{v} \pi \circ \beta \lambda \epsilon \notin$ as Phaed. 117 B), or sometimes furtively, of the stolen glances of lovers: see L. and S. s. v.

 $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau a i ̂ s$ is a dativus commodi. For $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta 6 \xi a \nu \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ see on

6. $\sigma \phi o ́ \delta p a$ тov- $\delta \iota a \phi$ bopev̀s cival: since it is easier $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \in i-$
 $\pi \omega \nu$ are opposed. The indictment of Socrates is to be found in Apol. 24 в $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \eta ~ \phi \eta \sigma i ̀ \nu$ ảdıкєì $\tau 0$ ús $\tau \in \nu$ ćovs $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \in i \rho o \nu \tau \alpha$


 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota \sigma \chi \nu \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$.
 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o u s ~ o u ̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$. B has $\tilde{\eta}$ : so Cron and Göbel. Schanz and Wohlrab read $\ddot{\eta}$ with some ms authority. $\hat{\eta}=$ Latin -ne? $\vec{\eta}=$ Latin an?: see on Apol. 26 в.

 Goodwin MT. p. 60. Hirschig reads ávaфaveîซ $\theta a l$.

тò тov̂ $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau o v s ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a=$ 'Socrates and everything about him'. So oi $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ "A $\nu v \tau o \nu=$ 'Anytus and those with him': Apol. 18 в. There is some contempt in the expression: cf. Hipp. Maior
 used in much the same way, only with still more contempt, e.g.
 Weariness and disgust are expressed by a similar phrase in the first

24. ol'єбӨai $\gamma \in X \rho \eta$ : a way of answering one's own question: so infra 54 b.
25. aंmapeîs : Socrates as an exile moving from city to city : cf.

 Laws are now replying to Crito's proposal in 45 c .
 $\kappa о \sigma \mu \dot{o} \tau \eta s: ~ a ̀ к о \lambda \alpha \sigma i a ~ o f ~ \sigma \omega \phi \rho о \sigma u ́ \nu \eta: ~ s e e ~ G o r g . ~ 506 ~ D-507 ~ A . ~ T h e s-~$ saly and Macedonia were almost proverbial for licence and debauchery: see (for Thessaly) Xen. Mem. I. 2. $24 \mathrm{~K} \rho \iota \tau i \alpha s-\phi u \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ eis
 and Theopompus ap. Athen. xir. 527 § $\hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ oì $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ $\sigma \grave{v} \nu \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ o j ~ \rho \chi \eta \sigma-$




27. $\omega$ s $\gamma \in \lambda o i \omega s$ : see on ка $\kappa \alpha \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau o s$ in 53 A.
28. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \delta \delta \delta \rho a \sigma \kappa \in s$ : the pictorial imperfect. $\sigma \kappa \epsilon v \eta$ is dress or apparel of some kind, generally unusual, as for instance the dress of an actor.
 The $\delta \iota \phi \theta \epsilon \epsilon \rho a$ was a shepherd's skin coat.

 $\tau \iota \nu a$ (line 28). The clause refers to personal disguises not connected with dress. B has кaтa入入ágas corrected to $\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\xi} a s$ in the margin. $\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu=$ 'to change': $\kappa a \tau a \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu=(\mathrm{I})$ 'to exchange' (2) 'to reconcile'.
33. oữ $\omega$ s airxp $\hat{s}$ goes with $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ and is explained by $\nu \delta \mu o u s 53 \mathrm{E}$ тoùs $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau o u s \pi a \rho a \beta a ́ s$.
 oủ.



36. $\boldsymbol{v \pi \epsilon \rho Х о ́ \mu є ข о s ~ = ~ ' c r i n g i n g ~ t o ' , ~ ' f a w n i n g ~ o n ' . ~ I n ~ t h i s ~ s e n s e ~}$ ( $=\theta \omega \pi \epsilon \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega$, $\pi \rho \dot{\rho} s \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota \nu \dot{j} \mu \iota \lambda \hat{\omega}) \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \in \rho \chi o \mu a \iota$ may be used outside pres. Indicative in good Attic: when = 'go under', then like ${ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \chi^{\prime} \mu a \iota$ and its compounds generally, it supplies the other parts from $\epsilon i \mu \ell$ ( $\hat{\eta} a$, $i \omega, i o \tau \mu \iota, i \theta \iota, i \notin \nu a \iota$, $i \omega \nu$, fut. $\epsilon i \mu \tau)$. Cobet, Variae Lectiones pp. 34, 307.
$\beta \iota \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon$. "Verbum $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ habet $\dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \iota \kappa \iota \sigma \tau l$ has formas $\zeta \hat{\omega}, \beta \iota \omega \sigma \sigma \mu a l$, ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta i \omega \nu, \beta \epsilon \beta i \omega \kappa a, \beta \epsilon \beta i \omega \tau a i \quad \mu o c$. $\beta t \hat{\omega}$ et $\epsilon \beta i o u \nu$ nemo dicit, sed $\zeta \hat{\omega}$ et
 semel et iterum comparet." Cobet, Var. Lect. p. 6io.
37. $\delta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{\omega} \omega v$ is not otiose, as Stallbaum points out: for the $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o s$ is a degree below the $\kappa \delta \hat{\lambda} a \xi$.


 used in connection with the luxury of the north cf. Ar. Ran. 83-

 thon had settled at the court of Archelaus king of Macedon. Schanz brackets and Kral rejects $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\theta} \epsilon \tau \tau \pi \lambda i q$ : but there is rhetorical force in the double mention of Thessaly at the end of the two clauses: see on 53 D line 26 .
38. $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ éni $\delta \epsilon i \pi v o v-O \epsilon \tau \tau a \lambda l a v ;$ added with bitter scorn to

54 A 40. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta}$ : alluding to Crito's plea in 45 C -D. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta}$ is like 'at enim' 'oh but', and introduces a counter-argument: see

 ai $\rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$. In accordance with this and other examples, I have printed a full stop after $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta s$ : the other editors take the sentence as interrogative.
42. $\tau i \delta^{\epsilon} ;=$ quid vero? Note the emphatic place of eis $\theta_{\epsilon \tau \tau \alpha-}$入íay: Thessaly had an evil name: see on 53 D .
 $\lambda a v ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$ has ironical force: the word is ordinarily used of something good. So in Eur. Phoen. 1204-5 К $\rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu \delta^{\prime}$ 'єоккє $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ द́ $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \nu \mu \phi \epsilon v-$
 construed generally with gen. of the object from which the enjoyment is derived, except where that object is a neuter pronoun: inferior mss here read $\tau 0 \hat{\tau}$ ó $\sigma o v$.
44. ov̉ i.e. ov̉к є̈ $\sigma \tau \alpha \iota$. $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon v \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu a \iota$ is used as well as $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \cup$ -
 бома..
45. छuvóvtos. छvveivai and छuvovoia are regularly used in Plato of the relation between teacher and pupil, e.g. Gorg. 515 в
 the $\tau$ óкоs $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ of Symp. 206 в.
46. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi เ \mu \wedge \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma o v \tau a t:$ see on 5 I A line 34 above. Schanz brackets
 tence is spoken from Socrates' point of view.
54 B 49. $\sigma$ ol of course goes with $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$. For oì $\epsilon \sigma \theta a l \gamma \epsilon \chi \rho \eta$ in the next line see on 53 D .

## CHAPTER XVI.

The Laws conclude their appeal by asking Socrates to think of the future world as well as this : see Introd. pp. viii and xvi.
2. трофєิิбь: see 51 A. Meiser reads toîs $\sigma o i ̂ s ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \tau a i ̂ s ~ к a i ~$ тoîs $\sigma$ oîs $\tau \rho 0 \phi \in \hat{v} \sigma \iota$.


 $\tau a \dot{\tau} \tau \eta$. Cobet needlessly rejects $\pi \rho \dot{\delta}$ : see Wohlrab in Fleckeisen’s Jahrb. for 1876 p. 126. For סíkatov see note on 45 C ễ $\tau \iota$ סè oú $\delta$ è Síkatov above.
 more dogmatically here than in the Apology : see 40 c foll. Compare Introd. p. xvi.





 бั่ ย̇кє̂.


 Gorg. 507 в.
 the future world : see on Apol. $40 \mathrm{E} \dot{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ ä $\rho \alpha \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ єiбiv ämaptes of

 $\pi o \iota$ are the $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau a l$, falsely so called : see Apol. 24 D-E. For the full significance of this sentence see Introduction pp. x-xi : and cf.

 laws, but the $\delta$ ккабтal.
 two participles that follow. There is an allusion to $49 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{D}$.
13. тараßа̀s кal какג̀ є́pyacáuєvos: these participles explain

 of $\sigma a v \tau^{2} \nu$ : oneself is the last person one should injure. Compare
 $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a v \tau \delta \nu \gamma \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$. Socrates' philosophy was egoism: see
 up the argument of Chapters $\mathrm{xI}-\mathrm{xv}$.
16. oi ėv "At $\delta$ ov vópot: Cron refers to Soph. Antig. 450 foll. oủ


54 D 19. $\mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \pi \in(\sigma \eta$ : Goodwin MT. p. 181.

## CHAPTER XVII.

Socrates concludes by giving his verdict in favour of the laws and constitution of Athens. Introd. pp. xi and xvi-xvii.
 this unusually long mode of address : Cobet and Naber utterly spoil the passage by omitting K $\rho \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ : Göbel omits $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau a i \rho \rho$.
 Corybantes were priests of Cybele whose worship was attended with much clamour of dancing and music on the flute. Lambinus aptly compares Hor. Epist. I. I. 7 ' est mihi purgatam crebro qui personet
 far more impressive. Just so the demonstrative is repeated in aüт $\eta$


 might have said much the same of his $\delta a \mu \mu \nu \nu$ ov $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ : compare Apol. 40 A-B. I think Plato meant to suggest that the pleading of the Laws coincided with the voice of the divine sign : see Introd. p. xvi.


 all only my present opinion '). Compare Gorg. 527 A and Phaed.


 The voice of the Laws seems to Socrates to be the voice of God: his divine sign would not allow him to escape. See Introd., p. xvi.

## APPENDIX.

## List of Deviations from the Bodlcian.

As the text of this edition is based upon Schanz's collation of the Bodleian, it may be convenient to note the most important deviations from this ms. When I differ from Schanz and the other editors, it will generally be found that I have kept more closely to the MS reading : most of the cases in which I have departed from it are discussed in the notes. Whenever I have adopted a reading which may be traced to some member of the second family of mSS, best represented by $\mathrm{T}=$ Bekker's $\mathfrak{t}$, I have signified this by writing fam. sec. after the reading in question.

Readings of B.

| 43 A | $\pi \rho \omega i$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 43 B | єvєрүєтทтаь <br>  |
| C | $\pi \rho \omega l$ |
|  | $\chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\eta} \nu$ каì $\beta a \rho \epsilon i ̂ a \nu$ ("каі $\beta$ арєíà punctis notatum " Sch.) |
| 43 D |  (" $\nu$ verbi $\delta$ окєì punctis notata in B." Sch.) |
| 44 B |  |
| 44 C |  |
| $4+$ E | ä $\lambda \lambda \frac{\tau}{} \tau \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ́ t o u s ~$ (corrected by second hand) |
| 45 A | $\phi \circ \beta \hat{\eta}$ |
| 45 E | $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \alpha ́ \chi \theta a \iota$ <br> (corrected by second hand) $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ <br> тò $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau a i ̂ o \nu ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \pi$ ou |
| 46 A | $\pi \in \pi \rho \alpha \chi \chi \theta a \iota$ |
|  | (corr. sec. manus) |
| 46 D |  $\nu v \nu \delta \grave{r}$ |
| 7 A | ${ }^{d} \nu \sigma \epsilon$ |

The present edition.

```
\pi\rho\dot{\psi}
\epsilon\dot{\eta}\eta\gamma\dot{\varepsilon}\tau\eta\tauа\iota
\etaú\deltaa\iota\muóvı\sigmaa
\pi\rho\varphi
\chia\lambda\epsilon\pi\grave{\eta}\nu(fam.sec.)
```

$\delta о к \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \nu 0 \iota \eta ँ \xi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ (fam. sec.)

$\sigma \dot{\varphi} \zeta \zeta \epsilon\rangle$
ä入入o тı $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ́ t o l s ~$
$\phi 0 \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$
$\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \hat{\chi} \theta a \iota$
$\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$ (fam. sec.)
тò $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau a i ̂ o \nu ~ \delta \dot{\eta}$ (fam. sec.)
$\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \hat{\chi} \theta a \iota$

$\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \bar{\eta}$
ä $\nu \sigma \dot{\epsilon}$

Readings of B ．
47 B $\delta \eta \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$
\＃$\varepsilon i$
（corr．sec．manus）
47 D ŋ̂ $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau o \hat{c}$ évbs （corr．sec．manuc）
$\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \lambda o v \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu \in \nu$（？）
47 E $\hat{\eta}$ oủx ；
（corr．sec．manus）

48 A $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota$
48 в $\delta \eta \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$
$\tau \hat{\omega} \kappa \alpha i \pi \rho \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$
$48 \mathrm{E} \pi \epsilon і ̂ \sigma a l$ $\sigma \epsilon$ тav̂тa $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$, à入à $\mu \grave{\eta}$ äкоутоs
$49 \mathrm{~A} \hat{\eta}$（saepius：corr．sec．ma－ nus）
$\dot{\omega} \mu о \lambda о \gamma \dot{\eta} \theta \eta ; \quad 8 \pi \epsilon \rho$ каі ă $\rho \tau є$ $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \gamma \tau 0^{\circ} \hat{\eta} \pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota$
$\tau \eta \lambda \iota к о i ́ \delta \epsilon \gamma$ ச́िоодтєs ă $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$
49 B ov่ $\delta a \mu \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~s} \hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha$

（corr．sec．manus）
50 B iб $\chi^{\chi} \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ tàs $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma a s$ （corr．sec．manus）
$50 \mathrm{C} \dot{\eta}$ каі таи̂та
$\dot{\eta} \notin \mu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ （corr．sec．manus）
$50 \mathrm{E} \quad \not{ }^{\prime \prime} \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \xi{ }^{\prime}$ l $\sigma 0 \cup$

51 A $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi a \tau \rho i \delta a \dot{\alpha} \rho a$ $\epsilon \xi \notin \sigma \tau a \iota$ द́ád $\sigma \epsilon$
 $\hat{\eta}$ oŭ ；（corr．sec．manus）
51 D

53 A катаүє́ $\lambda a \sigma \tau$ ós $\tau \epsilon$

53 D ката入入ג́そas
（corr．in marg．sec．manus）
54 B ойтє о่ б七ஸ́тєроע

The present edition．
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \dot{\delta} \dot{\eta}$
ท̄ $\hat{\eta}$（fam．sec．）

$\dot{\alpha} к о \lambda o u \forall \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \in \boldsymbol{y}$（fam．sec．）
ทे oủ $\boldsymbol{l}$ ；
\＃ौ фаu入óтєрор
à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota$
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$
$\kappa а i ̀ \pi \rho \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$
$\pi \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma a l$ $\sigma \epsilon, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\jmath}$ ăкоутоs $\tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \ell \nu$
介）

$\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o l \delta \epsilon \not \partial \not \partial \delta \rho \epsilon s$
oủ $\delta a \mu \omega \hat{s}$ àpa
引） 0 ；
ioxúovatv
 sec．）
$\hat{\eta}$ каl $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a$（fam．sec．）
$\ddot{\eta} \epsilon \notin \mu \epsilon \in \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$


$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \eta ̀ \nu \quad \pi a \tau \rho i \delta a a \not a \rho a$
ë éal
$\grave{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \sigma \bar{\epsilon}$

ทे oű；


 marg．manu satis vetusta add． b．＂Sch．
ката $\dagger \in \lambda a \sigma \tau$ ós $\gamma \in$（fam．sec．）
$\tau \hat{\nu} \nu a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \delta \dot{\delta} \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$（fam．sec．）
$\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda d \xi \neq \alpha$（fam．sec．）


## IN DEX．

The numbers refer to the pages．

## 

Acc．of part．after preceding dat． 69
áycos 67
ayptos 70
aัวóv 38
à $\gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \mu \eta \tau o ́ s 7^{2}$

aipeîv 54

aiбхи́vouat $\mu$ ŋ́ 37
ג́колабіа ${ }^{2} 6$
áкoúєьข pass．to $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \in \nu$
d̀ $\lambda \eta \theta$ єía 43
à $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s 43$
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a \iota \in \in ้{ }^{2}+$
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha{ }_{5} 0$
à $\lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{2} 6$
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta} 78$
д̈入入o $\tau \iota$ 華 61
ă $\lambda \lambda \omega{ }^{2} 43$
äd $\lambda \omega \mathrm{\omega} \pi$ тоєєîv 33
ä $\mu a$ as a prep． 39
Amphipolis 68
$a ̆ \nu$ w．fut．inf． 76
д̀ $\nu \alpha \beta \iota \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a \iota 54$


à $\nu a \chi \omega \rho \in \grave{\nu} \nu 8$


$\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu{ }^{25}, 26,65$
алтокіа 69
д่ $т о к а ́ \mu \nu є \iota \nu ~ 35 ~$
ȧтоктเขขúval 52
àmo入aúeı 78
ảாo入入úval עópous 6 r

âpa expresses surprise $43,57,6_{5}$
$\hat{\alpha} \rho a$ or $\hat{a} \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\epsilon} 3^{2}$
$\hat{\alpha} \rho \alpha \mu \dot{\prime}$ or $\tilde{a} \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta{ }^{\prime} 32$
＇A $\rho \chi$ € $\lambda$ aos 35
Asyndeton 45

Athletes，food of 46
äтотор versus äँорор 28
Attraction of antecedent 35
，，＂relative 60
àфıéval 53
a ¿utá＇the subject＇ 30
aủtíxa 30
$\beta \iota \alpha ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota)(\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu \bar{\nu}$
阝ıồv 77

$\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ introductory 26


$\gamma \in \nu \nu \hat{a} \nu$ i．q．$\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota \pi$ тotєิ้ 63
$\gamma \in \nu \nu a ̂ \nu$ i．q．$\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \nu G_{3}$
$\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta$ тai versus $\gamma \in \nu \nu \hat{q} \tau a \iota 69$
$\gamma i \gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a i \operatorname{T} \tau \nu{ }^{41}$
Conj．where we should expect opt． 23
Conj．Deliberativus 73
Copula omitted 34， 40
Cosmopolitanism 74
סaıно́vıo $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ so
$\delta \epsilon$ in interrogation 66
Death better than incurable dis－ ease 50
$\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ supplied from verbal in－$\tau \hat{c} o \nu$ 68
סéov 47
Despair of Athens 59
$\delta \eta \lambda \alpha \delta \dot{\eta}$ adverbial 52
$\delta \bar{\lambda} \lambda \frac{\nu}{0}$ öт 74
Delos，mission to 24
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o s$ used personally 30
$\delta \iota a \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a i ́ \tau \iota \sigma \iota \nu$, èv $\tau \iota \sigma \iota \nu, \pi \rho o ́ s$ tivas 3 r
ס＜aфépet 57
$\delta \iota a \phi \in \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \mathrm{~F} 7 \mathrm{I}$
סцафє́́ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \nu 39$
סiкal＇decisions＇62， 63
סікаиор 36， 79
סiкalós єimi 33
סıкаloб⿱㇒́ข ${ }_{4} 6$
Divinity of soul 5 r
бокє̂̂ боь parenthetical 61
סокєîv used absolutely 25
бокєцабіа 69
סoû̀os $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu{ }^{\nu}{ }^{\prime} \mu \omega \nu{ }_{4}$
Duality of soul and body 49
Education in Athens 64 $\epsilon{ }^{6} 3 \mathrm{I}$

eîev 47
$\epsilon^{\prime} \theta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \partial \ddot{\partial} \pi \omega s \quad \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} 6 \mathrm{I}$
єi $\mu a \rho \mu \dot{\text { én }} \boldsymbol{\eta}{ }^{2}{ }^{2}$
єi $\sigma \in \rho \chi$ оиає $3^{8}$
єi $\sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota{ }_{51}$
єїбoסos 38
tĩa indignabundum 23
єїтє каі＇or if you like＇ 58
$\epsilon \epsilon \kappa$ of the agent ${ }^{2} 5$

$\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \in \hat{\imath}(\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon і \bar{\sigma} \epsilon)$ of future world 79

є่кхєєi้ 57
è $\lambda \in \gamma=\nu$ with aor．force 44
є̇ $\mu \beta \rho a \chi$ и́ 75
${ }^{2} \mathrm{E} \mu \pi$ тоvба 41， 42

ṫv $\nu$ oîs 24
є̇̀бкєvá̧єбӨal 77
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \rho \in \pi \in \sigma \theta a \iota{ }_{72}$

ย̇ขútviò 27

є́ॄovбia 68
ย̇ாaíєเข 47
ย̇ $\pi \iota \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \hat{s} \pi$ ádal 23
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon і \bar{\sigma} \theta a \iota \sigma 6$
 67
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \nu 42$
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta s$ and $\grave{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \alpha \mu a \iota 46$

є́คабтóv 47

$\dot{\epsilon} \varphi \omega \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \tau є \kappa а і$ à $\pi о к р і \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ 63$
ÊTl Kail עû̀ 28

$\epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu 47$
єن̉ŋрүє́т $\eta \tau \alpha \iota$ better than $\epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \in \tau \eta$－ Tal 22
єủvo䒑єîซ $\theta a \iota ~ 73$
є $\dot{v} \omega \chi \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota 77$
є̇фіттанац 61
${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \omega s$ w．past tense of Ind． 31
ケグv 77

$\eta=$ Latin an $7^{76}$
$\eta$ nuperfluous 30
$\hat{\eta} ;=$ Lat．－ne ？ $7^{6}$
$\hat{\eta}$ ；versus $\eta$ ； 67
ที่ ov่；versus ทิ ov่； 64
$\dot{\eta} \theta$ ckós 2 I
$\hat{\eta} \nu$ rather than $\hat{\eta} \nu{ }^{\prime} \nu \quad 6_{5}$
$\hat{\eta} \nu=$＇is ex hypothesi＇ 49
＇Нро́дıкоs 46
$\eta \dot{\cup} \delta a \iota \mu o ́ v \iota \sigma \alpha$ better than $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a \iota \mu \mu^{-}$－ $\nu$ ขба 23
$\theta a v \mu a ́ s \omega$ ö $\bar{\pi} \omega \mathrm{c} 22$
$\theta \epsilon \in \lambda \omega$ versus $\bar{\epsilon} \theta \in \lambda \omega 33$
Өєтта入la 35
$\theta \in \omega$ pia 7 I
Ө $\dot{\eta} \beta a \zeta \epsilon 75$
$\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega 25$
$\theta \rho \dot{\prime} \psi о \mu a l$ better than $\tau \rho a \phi \eta \eta_{\sigma} \rho \mu a \iota$ $7^{8}$
ia $\rho \rho \dot{s}$ ที $\pi \alpha \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s 45$
Immortality 79

Imperfect and aor．combined， 63， 72
Imperfect used pictorially， 77
iva w．past tense of Ind． 31
Inf．pres．after $\dot{\dot{j}} \mu_{0} \lambda 0 \gamma \hat{\omega}$ etc． $7^{\circ}$

каӨá $\pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota 71$
каӨоцолоүєіً 59
каі－$\delta$ é 66
каі－каі－ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$－каi 46
каi ठ̀̀ каí 48
какйs daкои́єєข pass．of как⿳⺈s $\lambda \epsilon$－ rєוD 65
$\kappa а \lambda \lambda \omega \pi i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\omega} \dot{\gamma}^{7} 2$
катаүє́入абто⿱ 74
катá $\epsilon \lambda \omega \mathrm{c} 38$
ката入入á⿱㇒夫є 77
K $\bar{\beta} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}{ }^{2} 34$
$\kappa \iota \nu \delta \nu \nu \in \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu 27$
Knowledge as virtue 31
коьท̂ŋ бкотєîע 43
кори阝а⿱亠䒑兀єิ̂̀тєs 80
ко́б $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ оя 76
K $\rho i \tau \omega \nu{ }_{2} I$
$\lambda \alpha \mu \beta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$＇take to wife＇$\sigma_{3}$
Lamprocles 36
Laws personified 61
$\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \iota$ ）（ oúdè̀ $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu 44$
$\lambda \epsilon u \kappa \grave{\eta} \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \eta$ symbolical of joy 27

$\lambda \iota \pi о \tau а \xi$ iov $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} 68$
入óros 40
$\lambda \nu \mu a i v \in \sigma \theta a{ }_{5}{ }_{5}$ I
$\lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota 4_{4,51}$
$\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ of́ 39
Marriage laws 63
Méरа $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon ~ 75$
$\mu \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ without $\delta \dot{\delta}{ }_{2} 5$
$\mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ 32，$^{2}$ 5
$\mu$ ย̀̀ oû̀ 22
$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ́$ versus $\mathfrak{z o v}$ 50， 54
$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu 77$
нєтоккєì 69
$\mu \eta$ ท̂ 54
$\mu$ ク̀ oú 24
$\mu \eta$ position of 49
$\mu \eta^{\prime}$ w．3rd pers．Aor．Conj． 80
$\mu \eta{ }^{\prime}$ w．Aor．Imp． 35

＇Mixed conditional sentence＇
40
Mop $\mu$ and the like 41
$\mu о v \sigma \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha i$ үv $\mu \nu а \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \sigma_{+}$
ขоцоөєтькท่ 46
$\nu \subset \sigma \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon S 49$
voûs 67
$\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ठ́ $3 \mathbf{I}$
$\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ or $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta} 44$
$\xi \check{v} \nu$ versus $\mu \in \tau \alpha \dot{50} 54$
$\xi \nu \nu \in i v a \iota$ and $\xi v \nu o v \sigma i a \tau^{8}$


－îò $\tau \epsilon$ ö้ каl סuvaтóv 39
ö $\mu o t o s$, how different from $\dot{o}$ av－ tós 41
ö $\mu о$ оо каі $\pi \rho о ́ \tau \in \rho о \nu ~ 52$

óvt $\omega \mathrm{s} 43$
ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \omega 35$

b＇$\rho \theta \rho o s$ $\beta$ atús 22
ö $\sigma a \gamma \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon a$ 44， 80
ठ̈ $\sigma \omega \nu$ defined 79

ö $\tau \iota$ in direct quotation 62
ö $\tau \iota$ versus ô $\tau \iota 51$
oủ w．inf． 27
$o v ̉ \mu \dot{\eta}$ w．Fut．Ind．or Aor．Conj． 29
oú pia 28


oú $\delta \epsilon i$ ồs $\epsilon \in \in \hat{\imath ̂} 77$
oú $\delta \epsilon \nu l$ द̆v̀v $\nu \hat{\varphi} 54$
oủ $\delta \epsilon \nu$ l $\tau \rho o ́ \pi \Psi \dot{\psi} \dot{a} \delta \iota \kappa \eta \tau \in ́ o \nu$ єival ${ }_{5} 6$
oủסє́ $\tau \in a$ adverbial 32
oû̃os deictic 34
oîros contemptuous 33,54
oûros＇that of yours＇ 42
$\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i a 37$
$\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \cup \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ versus $\grave{\pi} \alpha \iota \delta \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \mu a \iota$ 78
$\pi a i \delta \omega \nu \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \in \rho \epsilon \iota \nu 5$
$\pi a \nu \tau \grave{\partial} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu{ }_{5}{ }^{\text {® }}$
$\pi а \rho а к р о и ́ є \iota \nu ~ 44$
$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \mu \epsilon \in \epsilon L \nu 55$
$\pi a v ̂ e ~ a n d ~ \pi a \hat{v a a l ~} 55$
$\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ used absolutely 55,67
$\pi є р і т о$ дос 69
т $\eta \nu$ ıкка $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a 22$
Hitтакоs 58
Play upon words 27,46
$\pi \lambda \in i ́ \omega$ adverbial 41
$\pi o \hat{\imath}=\epsilon$ is $\tau i{ }_{4} 8$
тotciv $\tau \iota 44$
тoteì $\tau l$ tuva 66
тоขךpos 50
Potidaea 68
$\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a=$ profession 45
$\pi \rho а к т є \in \nu 2 I$

$\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta \in \cup ́ \epsilon \ell \nu 41$
$\pi \rho^{\prime} i \nu$ w．past tense of Ind． 3 I
$\pi \rho \delta$ after comparatives 79
$\pi \rho о \delta \iota \delta o ́ v a \iota 37$
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[^3]:    'The ship will arrive to morrow. A vision has told me that I shall live two days.'

[^4]:    Bucolica. By the same Editor. Is. $6 d$. Georgicon Libri I. II. By the same Editor. $2 s$. Libri III. IV. By the same Editor. $2 s$. The Complete Works. By the same Editor. Two vols. Vol. I. containing the Introduction and Text. 3s. $6 d$ d. Vol. II. The Notes. $45.6 d$.

[^5]:    "We can cordially recommend this series of text-books."-Church Review.
    "The notes elucidate every possible difficulty with scholarly brevity and clearness, and a perfect knowledge of the subject."-Saturday Review.
    "Accurate scholarship is obviously a characteristic of their productions, and the work of simplification and condensation appears to have been judiciously and skilfully performed."-Guardian.
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